

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

MANAGING EDITOR :

A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS :

JAMES W. BRIGHT. HERMANN COLLITZ.

EIGHT NUMBERS A YEAR.

BALTIMORE, MD.

SINGLE COPY (CURRENT)  
TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER AT THE BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, POSTOFFICE.

## CONTENTS.

HAGEN, SIVERT N.—CLASSICAL NAMES AND STORIES IN THE <i>Beowulf</i> - - - - -	65-74
FITZ-GERALD, JOHN D.—GALDOS'S <i>Electra</i> - - - - -	74-76
BELDEN, H. M.—DONNE'S COMPASSES AND WITHER'S COMPASS. - - - - -	76-78
EVANS, M. BLAKEMORE.—A PASSAGE IN <i>Hermann und Dorothea</i> - - - - -	78-79
JONAS, J. B. E.—INTERPRETATION OF A DISPUTED PASSAGE IN <i>Goetz von Berlichingen</i> - - - - -	79-80

### Reviews:—

BROWN, A. C. L.—IWAIN, A STUDY IN THE ORIGINS OF ARTHURIAN ROMANCE. [Wm. A. Nitze.] - - - - -	80-84
PATON, LUCY A.—STUDIES IN THE FAIRY MYTHOLOGY OF ARTHURIAN ROMANCE. [Wm. A. Nitze.] - - - - -	
VOS, R. J.—KINDER-UND HAUSMÄRCHEN DER BRÜDER GRIMM. [G. T. Dippold.] - - - - -	84-86
KASTNER, L. E.—A HISTORY OF FRENCH VERSIFICATION. [Albert Schinz.] - - - - -	86-90
BALDENSBERGER, FERNAND.—GOTTFRIED KELLER, SA VIE ET SES ŒUVRES. [Albert Haas.] - - - - -	90-91
PINEAU, LÉON.—LES VIEUX CHANTS POPULAIRES SCANDINAVES. [Arthur F. J. Remy.] - - - - -	91-96

### Reviews, continued:—

BÉDIER, JOSEPH.—ETUDES CRITIQUES. [Lucien Foulet.] - - - - -	96-100
PARIS, GASTON.—FRANÇOIS VILLON. [Hugo P. Thieme.] - - - - -	100-103
FITZMAURICE-KELLY, JAMES.—LOPE DE VEGA AND THE SPANISH DRAMA. [Hugo Albert Rennert.] - - - - -	103-104
USTERI, PAUL, ET RITTER, EUGÈNE.—LETTRES INÉDITES DE MME DE STAËL À HENRI MEISTER. [William Koren.] - - - - -	105-107
CARTER, MARY D., AND MALLOY, CATHARINE.—CUENTOS CASTELLANOS, SELECTED AND EDITED WITH NOTES AND VOCABULARY. [R. E. Bassett.] - - - - -	107-109
HERVEY, WILLIAM ADDISON.—UNTER VIER AUGEN VON LUDWIG FULDA; DER PROCESS, LUSTSPIEL VON RODERICH BENEDIX. [Chiles Clifton Ferrell.] - - - - -	109-110
GEDDES, JR., J., AND JOSSELYN, JR., F. M.—HISTORIA DE GIL BLAS DE SANTILLANA POR LESAGE, TRADUCIDA POR EL PADRE ISLA. [J. D. M. Ford.] - - - - -	110
MEYER, PAUL.—NOTICE D'UN MANUSCRIT DE TRINITY COLLEGE (Cambridge). [M. J. Minckwitz.] - - - - -	110-111
FITZMAURICE-KELLY, JAMES.—THE COMPLETE WORKS OF MIGUEL DE CERVANTES SAAVEDRA. [Hugo A. Rennert.] - - - - -	111-112

### Correspondence:—

FITZ-GERALD, JOHN D.—GALDOS'S <i>Doña Perfecta</i> , - - - - -	112
--	-----

## FROM PRIVATE LIBRARY.

Grimm, *Wörterbuch* complete until 1898 (M. 269), 8 vols. half roan, remainder unbound, \$28.00. What has appeared since obtainable through any bookseller. **Weimar Edition of Goethe**, Series I, works proper including 6 vol. still to appear (unbound about M. 190), complete in 57 vol. bound in 56 vol. half roan, \$45.00. **Goethe-Jahrbuch**, complete set of 24 vol. + 2 vol. indices, all original prints without any anastatic reprints, \$40.00. **Brockhaus, Konversations Lexikon**, ed. 1892-97, 17 Originalbände (M. 170), \$18.00. Besides: Grimm Mythologie, 4. ed.; Weigand, *Wörterbuch*, 4 ed.; Schade, *Wörterbuch*, 2 ed.; Brugmann, *Grundriss*, vol. I, II, 1, II, 2, and vol. of indices, 1 ed.; Euphorion, vol. II; Milchsack, *Historia Faust*; etc., etc. Apply to the

JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

Contributors and Publishers will please send all matter intended for the German department of the NOTES to Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; for the English department to Prof. J. W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University; all matter for other departments should be forwarded to the Managing Editor of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Johns Hopkins University. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

A price-list for the PUBLISHED VOLUMES of the NOTES, and rates for ADVERTISING will be sent on request.

## RECENT

## MODERN LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS

Alarcón. El Niño de la Bola (Schwill) . . . . .	\$0.90
Augier and Sandeau. Le Gendre de M. Poirier (Roedder) . . . . .	.40
Chateaubriand. Les Aventures du Dernier Abencerage (Bruner) . . . . .	.30
Dillard. Aus dem Deutschen Dichterwald . . . . .	.60
Dresden. German Composition . . . . .	.40
Dumas. Les Trois Mousquetaires (Fontaine) . . . . .	.60
Foa. Le Petit Robinson de Paris (De Bonneville) . . . . .	.45
Fouqué. Undine (Senger) . . . . .	.50
François. Beginner's French . . . . .	.65
Galdós. Doña Perfecta (Lewis) . . . . .	1.00
Grimm. Kinder- und Hausmärchen (Vos) . . . . .	.45
Kutner. Commercial German . . . . .	1.00
La Fontaine. Fifty Fables (McKenzie) . . . . .	.40
Larra. Partir á Tiempo (Nichols) . . . . .	.40
Merimée. Colomba (Williamson) . . . . .	.40
Molière. Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme (Roi & Guitteau) . . . . .	.35
Monsanto & Langueillier. Practical Course in Spanish—Revised (Josselyn) . . . . .	1.25
Moratin. El Sí de las Niñas (Geddes & Josselyn) . . . . .	.50
Sandeau. Mlle. de la Seiglière (White) . . . . .	.40
Scheffel. Der Trompeter von Säckingen (Buehner) . . . . .	.75
Syms. Easy First French Reader . . . . .	.50

## AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO BOSTON

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

## A MONTHLY PUBLICATION

(With intermission from July to October inclusive)

Devoted to the Interests of the Academic Study of English,  
German and the Romance Languages.

ALL SUBSCRIPTIONS PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$1.50 PER ANNUM

For the United States and Canada; for all Foreign Countries  
included in the Postal Union, \$1.75.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

## ENGLISH.

- Abramczyk, R.**—Über die Quellen zu Walter Scott's Roman "Ivanhoe." Dissertation. *Leipzig*: 1903.
- Anders, H. R. D.**—Shakespeare's Books. A dissertation on Shakespeare's Reading of the immediate sources of his Works. *Berlin*: George Reimer, 1904.
- Auer, Johannes.**—Walter Savage Landor in Seinen Beziehungen zu den Dichtern des Trecento Dante, Boccaccio, Petrarca. Münster Dissertation. *Rheydt*: Th. Buresch, 1903.
- Baker, George P.**—'The Good Natur'd Man' and 'She Stoops to Conquer,' by Oliver Goldsmith. The introduction and biographical and critical material by Austin Dobson. [The Belles-Lettres Series.] *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co., 1904.
- Bateson, Mary.**—Mediæval England. English Feudal Society from the Norman Conquest to the Middle of the Fourteenth Century. *New York*: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.
- Bell, Mrs. A.**—Lives and Legends of the English Bishops and Kings. *London*: Bell, 1904.
- Benson, A. C.**—Alfred Tennyson. *London*: Methuen, 1904.
- Berners.**—Froissart. Vol. vi. [The Tudor Translations.] *London*: D. Nutt, 1903.
- Bible, The English.**—Apocrypha. [Tudor Translations.] *London*: David Nutt, 1904.
- Billandeau, Armand George.**—French Idioms, Sayings, and Proverbs, with their English Equivalents. Revised by A. Antoine. *Paris*: Boyreau et Chevillet, 1904.
- Boas, Mrs. Frederick.**—In Shakespeare's England. *New York*: James Pott & Co., 1904.
- Böhme, Walther.**—Die Temporalsätze in der Übergangszeit von Angelsächsischen zum Altenglischen. Leipzig Dissertation. *Halle a. S.*: C. H. Kaemmerer & Co., 1903.
- Brown, C.**—L'Anglais Commercial. *Paris*: Larousse, 1903.
- Browne, Sir James Crichton and Carlyle Alexander.**—The Nemesis of Froude. *London*: John Lane, 1904.
- Browne, William Hand.**—The Taill of Rauf Coilyear, A Scottish Metrical Romance of the Fifteenth Century. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1903.
- Carlyle.**—New Letters and Memorials of Jane Welsh Carlyle. Annotated by Thomas Carlyle and edited by Alexander Carlyle with an Introduction by Sir James Crichton-Browne. Two volumes. *London*: John Lane, 1903.
- Carpenter, Geo. R., and Brewster, W. T.**—Modern English Prose. Edited. *New York*: Macmillan, 1904.
- Catalogue of Books Presented by Edward Capell to the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.** *Cambridge*: University Press, 1904.
- Child, Clarence Griffin.**—The Book of Merlin. The Book of Sir Bolin. From Malory's King Arthur with Caxton's Preface. Edited with Introductory Sketch and Glossary. *Boston*: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1904.
- Coleridge, Ernest Hartley.**—The Works of Lord Byron. Edited. Vol. vii. *New York*: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- Collins, J. C.**—Studies in Shakespeare. *London*: Constable, 1904.
- Compleat Angler, The,** of Izaak Walton and Charles Cotton. Edited. *London*: Methuen, 1904.
- Cook, E. T. and Wedderburn, A.**—Works of John Ruskin. Vol. iv: Modern Painters. Vol. viii: The Seven Lamps of Architecture. *London*: G. Allen, 1903.
- Courthope, W. J.**—A History of English Poetry. Vols. iii and iv. *London*: Macmillan Co., 1903.
- Craig, W. J.**—Shakespeare's Comedies, Shakespeare's Tragedies, and Shakespeare's Histories, Poems, and Sonnets. Edited in 3 vols. [Oxford Miniature Edition.] *London*: Oxford University Press, 1904.
- Dance of Death, English.**—From the Designs of Thomas Rowlandson. Founded on the Ackermann Edition of 1815. Two vols. *New York*: D. Appleton & Co., 1904.
- Dobson, Austin.**—Fanny Burney. [Madame d'Arblay.] [English Men of Letters Series.] *London*: Macmillan Co., 1904.
- Douse, T. le Marchant.**—Examination of an Old MS. Preserved in the Library of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick. *London*: Tayler and Frances, 1904.
- Earle, John.**—A Book for the Beginner in Anglo-Saxon, Comprising a Short Grammar, Some Selections from the Gospels, and a Parsing Glossary, newly revised. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Eichhoff, Theodor.**—Unser Shakespeare, Beiträge zu einer wissenschaftlichen Shakespeare-Kritik, I. *Halle a. S.*: Max Niemeyer, 1903.
- Engel, Eduard.**—Shakespeare-Rätsel. *Leipzig*: H. Seemann, 1904.
- Errara, Emilio.**—Carlo Dickens, con Prefazione di Angiolo Orvieto. *Bologna*: Nicola Zanichelli, 1903.
- Evans, Herbert Arthur.**—Shakespeare's The Life of King Henry the Fifth. Edited. *London*: Methuen, 1903.
- Farley, Frank Edgar.**—Scandinavian Influences in the English Romantic Movement. [Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature. Vol. ix.] *Boston*: Ginn & Co., 1903.
- Fest, Otto.**—Über Surrey's Virgilübersetzung. Teil I. Berlin Dissertation. *Weimar*: K. Wagners Sohn, 1903.
- Findlater, Andrew.**—Chamber's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Edited. *London*: 1903.
- Fischer, Julius.**—Das "Interlude of the Four Elements." Mit einer Einleitung neu herausgegeben. [Marburger Studien zur Englischen Philologie v.] *Marburg*: Elwert, 1903.
- Flather, J. H.**—Kenilworth of Sir Walter Scott. Edited. [Pitt Press Series.] *Cambridge*: University Press, 1904.
- Foley, Emily Howard.**—The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to the Gospel of Saint Matthew. Part I: Phonology. [Yale Studies in English.] *New York*: Henry Holt & Co., 1903.
- Fortescue, G. K.**—Subject Index of the Modern Works Added to the Library of the British Museum in the Years 1881-1900. Vol. iii, N-Z. Edited. Printed by Order of the Trustees, 1904.
- Froude, James Anthony.**—My Relations with Carlyle. *New York*: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- Fuhrmann, Ludwig.**—Die Belesenheit des Jungen Byron. Berlin Dissertation. *Friedenau bei Berlin*: Martin Kindler, 1903.
- Gairdner, James.**—The Paston Letters. Edited. Vol. ii. *London*: Chatto & Windus, 1904.
- Garnett, Richard.**—Browning's Essay on Shelley, Being his Introduction to the Spurious Shelley Letters. Edited. *London*: Moring, 1904.
- Gaskoin, C. J. B.**—Alcuin, his Life and his Work. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1904.
- Gosse, Edmund.**—Jeremy Taylor. [English Men of Letters Series.] *London*: Macmillan Co., 1904.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XIX.

BALTIMORE, MARCH, APRIL, 1904.

Nos. 3, 4.

## CLASSICAL NAMES AND STORIES IN THE *Bēowulf*.

The traditional and universal view of the *Bēowulf* assumes that it is a Germanic epic with respect to form and materials, for the Christian element, although not slight in bulk and importance, is regarded as a later addition to, or modification of, an originally heathen poem. Upon the basis of this assumption a very large 'literature' has grown up, and there has been room for many theories on many problems. I shall here briefly and tentatively present some materials bearing on the character of the poem. I regret that I am not yet able to deal as fully with the subject as its interest and importance demand, and I trust that scholars will generously accept what is now offered merely as a preliminary formulation of evidences and conclusions which I expect to treat more thoroughly at a later time. I shall try to show that many names and stories in the *Bēowulf* are of classical origin, and that the prevailing view of the poem as a Germanic epic must therefore be abandoned.

It may be said at the outset that not all evidences of connection between *Bēowulf* and classical materials are equally clear and convincing. If I shall succeed in establishing my general point of view, there will still be many questions unanswered, and the precise scope of classical influence will remain to be determined. On some points it is quite certain that differences of opinion will prevail even after the subject has been most thoroughly investigated by many scholars. It will sometimes be impossible to determine whether some features are Germanic or classical, or the results of a blending of these two sources or impulses.

The limitations of space will not permit me to discuss the history and character of the philological method by means of which I have been enabled to catch a few gleams of light in the darkness which surrounds the *Bēowulf*. It would be highly

fitting to indicate in this manner my indebtedness to the school of criticism whose most distinguished representative is Professor Sophus Bugge. It would also be of advantage for the discussion which follows, to indicate, in a general way, at least, what by this method has already been accomplished. There are and always will be differences of opinion on many details, but I believe that Bugge and others have shown that the mythological and heroic poetry of the so-called *Elder Edda* is of a composite character with respect to its materials: some elements are Germanic, some specifically Norse, and some are due to Christian or classical impulses.

It has been shown that Eddic poetry does not stand isolated from the European literature of its time. It is intimately and vitally connected with Western and Southern culture. The study of most literatures has led to similar conclusions with respect to them. Foreign impulses or materials may be traced in all great oriental and occidental literatures. The literatures of Greece and Rome, the romances of the Middle Ages, the folk-lore of Europe, all show an intermingling or blending of originally widely sundered elements. In the *Bēowulf* this may clearly be observed at least in the mingling of heathen and Christian materials.

That the so-called heathen element in the *Bēowulf* may be the result of a blending of native and foreign elements is a proposition which should not be considered improbable or absurd. The relations, peaceful and warlike, between Germans and Romans began at an early time and continued for a long period before Angles and Saxons are settled in England, and they have left tangible traces: Southern coins, ornaments, utensils, weapons, etc., which are found in Northern soil, are important witnesses of a lively and an early intercourse between Northern and Southern Europe; the Runic alphabet, whether of Latin or of Greek origin, was in use among Germanic peoples centuries before the Anglo-Saxon migration into England; and



the Latin loan-words in the early Germanic languages also clearly indicate the importance of Rome in early Germanic culture.<sup>1</sup> The early Germans learned so much from the Romans that it would not be surprising if they also learned something about Latin poetry and materials of poetry, such as names and stories of gods and heroes, and the like.

## I.

The great deeds of the hero Bēowulf are three in number, and chronologically arranged they are: (1) his swimming-match with Breca in youth; (2) his fights with Grendel and Grendel's mother in manhood; and (3) his fatal conflict with a fire-spitting dragon in old age. I shall in the present paper discuss the first two of these, beginning with Breca.

The name *Breca* seems appropriate for a great swimmer, cf. *brecan ofer bæðweg*, *Elene* 244, 'ferri cum impetu per undas,' and ON. *breki*, 'billow,' a word which precisely corresponds to OE. \**breca*. The word *Brondingas*, the name of the people ("der fingierte name des volkes")<sup>2</sup> over which Breca rules (cf. *Breoca* [*wēold*] *Brondingum*, *Widsið* 25), will receive the most consistent interpretation if we follow Müllenhoff<sup>3</sup> in connecting it with German *brandung*, 'breaker, surge,' which seems to have been borrowed from Low German, cf. Du. *branding*. The name is sometimes interpreted as 'Fire-folk' or 'Sword-folk,' cf. *brond*, 'fire, sword,' but this results in permitting Breca to fall out of his rôle as a great water-hero. The use of *brond*, 'fire' in the formation of a word for 'breaker' or 'surge' is semasiologically not more difficult than the use of the same word for 'sword'; the gleaming edge of the breaker as it dashes against the shore or, perhaps better, the surging of the waves resembling the welling of fire (cf. OE. *wylm*, 'surging, raging, of fire,' *sæ-wylm*,

'brandung der see')<sup>4</sup> easily accounts for this use of the word *brond*, 'fire.' There can be no well-grounded objection to calling our water-hero 'Swimmer, King of the Waves.'<sup>5</sup> It would indeed be small credit to Bēowulf if he won in a contest with a hero partly or wholly out of his element.

The names *Breca* and *Brondingas* easily range themselves in a supposed Germanic water-myth. Müllenhoff's interpretation of Bēowulf's swimming-match with Breca assumes that the hero is "ein der menschen wohlgesinntes göttliches wesen, das in seiner jugend, d. h. im frühjahr die rauheit und wildheit des winterlichen meeres bricht, den stürmischen character desselben überwindet. Dieser selbst ist durch seinen gegner oder mit-schwimmer Breca repräsentiert."<sup>6</sup> But not much can be done with the name of the father of Breca, *Bēanstān*, to render it corroborative of this interpretation. In one of his early articles<sup>7</sup> Müllenhoff confesses that he can not explain the name, but his last word on the matter was that the name "scheint auf die see und seeungeheur hinzudeuten (vgl. altn. *bauni*, walfisch)."<sup>8</sup> All parts of the story and the names as well are thus seen to be in most beautiful harmony with the interpretation mentioned.

But the name *Bēanstān* still continues to be troublesome. Even if its first element *bēan-* be identical with "altn. *bauni*, walfisch,"<sup>9</sup> it may still be a matter of doubt what it really means and how it originated. The attempt has been made to make it reasonable by "correcting" the first element so that the name would be \**Bānstān*, 'Bonestone, stone as hard as bone.'<sup>10</sup> This does not seem very plausible, and since \**Bānstān* does not stand in the text we must see in what direction plain *Bēanstān* will lead us.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Müllenhoff, *ZfdA.*, vol. VII, p. 420: "Aber Breca's name bedeutet innerhalb dieses mythus gerade den kräftigen schwimmer durch die wildbewegten fluten."

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> *ZfdA.*, vol. VII, p. 421, foot-note.

<sup>8</sup> *Beowulf*, p. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Professor J. M. Hart, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, vol. XVIII, p. 118, says that he can not find "ON. *bauni*" in any of the dictionaries. It may be a ghost-word, but where did Müllenhoff find it?

<sup>10</sup> Krüger, *Beitr.*, vol. IX, p. 573; approval by Bugge, *ibid.*, vol. XII, p. 55.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kluge, in Paul's *Grundriss*, vol. I, pp. 327 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Müllenhoff, *Beowulf*, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Falk og Torp, *Etym. Odb. over det norske og det danske Spr.*, s. v. *brænding* (Swed. *bränning*), very properly compare Lat. *æstus*, 'fire, surge.' Cf. Kluge, *Etym. Wtb.*, s. v. *branden*: "connected with *brand* and means lit. 'to blaze, move like flames.'"



No one has been able to prove the existence of a word which in form and meaning is in accordance with the two conjectures mentioned.<sup>11</sup> There is, however, a word *bean-stone* which has been overlooked in this connection because it has not been looked for in the right place. This is the name of a precious stone which resembles a bean in a certain respect. It is described by Pliny in his *Natural History*<sup>12</sup> thus: *Cyamea nigra est, sed fracta ex se fabae similitudinem parit*. In the Bohn translation<sup>13</sup> this reads, "*Cyamias* is a black stone, but when broken produces a bean to all appearance," and in the foot-note to *Cyamias* the editor uses the word *bean-stone*, but this has not found its way into the usual lexicographical works.<sup>14</sup> Now, there is another precious stone which bears a very similar name. This is the stone *cyanos*, also described by Pliny:<sup>15</sup> "We must also give a separate account of *cyanos*, a name which until very recently was given to a species of iaspis, on account of its ærulean color," etc. A considerable paragraph is devoted to this stone which is represented to have been of great value and very desirable. The names *cyamea* (*cyamias*) and *cyanos* could easily become confused on account of the great likeness between them and on account of the difficulty of distinguishing between *m* and *n*.<sup>16</sup> It is possible that the creator of the name *Bēanstān* was familiar only with *cyamea*, 'bean-stone,' but I do not consider this probable. It is at any rate clear that he has had the name *Oceanus* before him and that he has made an attempt to translate it into his own tongue. *Bēanstān* is a translation of [*O*]ceanus through what is now harshly termed a pseudo-learned etymology. No other etymologizing was possible at this time. A similar dis-

regard of an initial letter or letters was very common among the etymologists of the Middle Ages.<sup>17</sup> A very slight similarity between two widely sundered words was often sufficient for connecting them. Here, however, the similarity between *cyamea*, *cyanos*, and *Oceanus* is very great and the etymology is quite normal. How thankful we must be to the unreasoning scribe who wrote down *Bēanstān* instead of trying to explain it away!

If *Bēanstān* is *Oceanus* who, then, is *Breca*? Shall we look for him in a Germanic water-myth, or shall we seek him among the sons of *Oceanus*? Has *Breca* become the son of *Oceanus* in the same way, as, in a West Saxon Genealogy,<sup>18</sup> *Scēaf* has become the son of *Noah*? The answer must be a very guarded one. It will be remembered that *Oceanus* is the father of about three thousand river-gods, and it is possible that 'Swimmer, King of the Waves,' may be one of these.

The names *Breca* and *Brondingas* certainly agree very well with the conception of a river-god (a *rex aquarum*, *undarum*? was he described as *fluctifragus*, 'wave-breaker'?), and the story connected with him in the *Bēowulf* is such that it may easily be thought of as having originated from some classical story of a river-god. I conjecture that the swimming-match may have originated from the contest of Hercules with the river-god Achelous. This was, indeed, a wrestling-match (*certamen*), but it may be thought of as having been converted into a swimming-match for the reason that the conception of a river-god as a great swimmer might most easily arise.<sup>19</sup> A contest (*wettkampf*, not *kampf*) with a swimmer might very naturally lose its identity as a wrestling-match, but the four chief elements of the story, hero, river-god, contest, and victory of hero, would still remain. The contest of Hercules with Achelous has for its object the winning, by one or the other of the opponents, of *Deianira*, the

<sup>11</sup> Boer, *Ark. f. nord. Filologi*, vol. XIX, p. 35 f., reaches no conclusion with regard to the name, but suggests the meaning 'kern der bohne,' cf. *bēan-belgas*, 'beanpods, husks, cods.'

<sup>12</sup> Bk. XXXVII, 73.

<sup>13</sup> Vol. VI, p. 460; cf. also Pliny's paragraph on *Cyamos*, 'bean,' *ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 347 f. (= XXI, 51).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Andrews, *Lat. Lex.*, s. v. *cyamea*: 'the bean-stone, a now unknown precious stone.'

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, XXXVII, 38; Bohn, vol. VI, p. 432.

<sup>16</sup> Bugge, *Home of the Eddic Poems*, p. 101, cites a form *Ánarr*, *Ónarr* from *Amor*, and also from *Gislason*, *Prøver*, p. 409, *mesopotania* < *Mesopotamia*, p. 118, *epineus* < *Opimius*.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. W. P. Mustard, *The Etymologies in the Servian Commentary to Vergil*, Colorado Springs, 1892.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Earle-Plummer, *Two Sax. Chron.*, II, p. 4.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Roscher, *Lexicon*, s. n. *Kapros*: "1) Flussgott auf Münzen von Atusa in Assyrien aus der parthischen periode, zu fussen der sitzenden stadtgöttin ('The city seated on a rock from which issues a swimming river-god, the Caprus, with long goat's horns'), Head, p. 690, nach Gardner, *Parthian Coins*, Pl. 7, 22."

daughter of the king of Aetolia. Achelous first changes himself into a serpent and then into a bull, but is vanquished by Hercules, who tears one of his horns out by the roots, and he is metamorphosed into a river. The story of such a contest may have lost its particular details and again have been expanded by the addition of new ones, enough of the original one remaining to mark its identity. It will of course be understood that no attempt is here made to account for the specific form of the "match" in *Bēowulf* or in the *Egils Saga Ásmundar*.<sup>20</sup> This form of the story may have been developed in the North or it may have been founded upon the story of a swimming-match which already existed in Latin as a variation of the Hercules-Achelous legend.<sup>21</sup> The localization of the story (*Bēowulf* is said to have reached *Finna lond*) is certainly a Northern feature, but it can not otherwise be determined how much is classical and how much Germanic.

## II.

That the Grendel myth may also be founded upon, or show traces of, a classical story, is a possibility which must next be investigated. If *Bēanstān* is Oceanus, and if his son *Breca* may be a classical river-god, perhaps Achelous, then it is also possible that *Bēowulf* may be Hercules, or that he may have borrowed features from Hercules. The Grendel myth also raises the question of the identity of *Bēowulf*, but it is perhaps best to approach this question indirectly through a discussion of the identity of the Grendel monsters. The disguise of Oceanus and of a river-god in the *Breca* story is of such a character that

<sup>20</sup> For the details see Bugge, *Beitr.*, vol. xii, pp. 51 ff.

<sup>21</sup> There are numerous forms of this fable in literature and art. In the First Vatican Mythograph (Bode, *Mythographi Vaticani*, I, 58) the legend has become mixed up with the Alpheus story: "Oeneus, Parthaonis filius, rex Aetoliae, regnique sedem habens in Calydone, Deianiram filiam habuit, quam Hercules et Alpheus, qui et Achelous, dum peterent in conjugiam, pater opposuit illis hanc legem, ut invicem conluctantes, qui certamini alterum vinceret, illi Deianiram uxorem duceret . . . . Alpheus, seu Achelous, confusus Alcidis virtute, mutatis est in amnem, elapsis hostilibus palmis; et timens semper, ne usquam appareat inimici praesentia, per concava terrarum undis Siciliae affluit."

we must not expect to find a school-book version of a classical fable intact in the Grendel episode if it should prove to be of such an origin.

It will be useful to have the main points of the story in mind. Grendel is a monster which dwells in a swamp not far from the house Heorot, a magnificent mead-hall erected by *Hrōðgār*, king of the Danes. He comes by night and seizes thirty warriors whom he carries off to devour in his lair. He soon returns, and for twelve long years the Danes must suffer his nightly visits in their hall, which must be practically abandoned to the monster. News of their plight reaches *Bēowulf* the *Gēat*, who comes over the sea in order to slay him. He engages with him in a combat without arms and vanquishes him by tearing off his arm and shoulder. Grendel rushes back to his dwelling in the swamp to die. But the next night Grendel's mother comes to avenge her son. She seizes and carries off one of the beloved thanes of *Hrōðgār*. *Bēowulf* descends through the water to her cave where he, after a fierce combat, succeeds in killing her with a sword which he finds there, his own having proved useless. He also cuts off the head of the dead Grendel, which he brings back to Heorot as a trophy of his victory. The sword is melted by Grendel's blood.

There must be something unique about this fable, for it has not been possible to find a Germanic story bearing any great similarity to it. The Scandinavian parallels, especially that in the *Grettis Saga*, are so much like the story in *Bēowulf* that they have been considered to be connected with the latter. Müllenhoff<sup>22</sup> says: "Ähnliche sagen, namentlich solche von kampf mit einem wassermann, der eine mühle beunruhigt u. dgl., sind jetzt häufig . . . . Aber in ihnen allen fehlt der kampf mit der mutter." This uniqueness of the fable has led to the theory that the fight with Grendel's mother is unoriginal. That there are two monsters so much alike might, of course, easily lead one to consider the second a repetition and a variation of the first; but there are, on the other hand, such differences between them, and especially between the two fights, that

<sup>22</sup> *Beowulf*, p. 2.

both must be held to be equally original until the contrary is proved. Unsophisticated readers of the *Beowulf* certainly regard the second fight as the crowning achievement of the hero and as the centre of interest in the first part of the poem. The so-called "lieder-theorie," which touches the point at issue, has proved nothing with respect to the poem, and its forcible application in this field has been a failure. I can not discuss it here, nor do I consider it necessary to do so.

No agreement has been reached among scholars with reference to the meaning of the name *Grendel* and of the myth. A resumé of some of the most important of the speculations concerning these subjects will in a general way show where we now stand.

Grimm<sup>23</sup> connected the name *Grendel* with OE. *grindel*, OHG. *krintil*, MHG. *grintel*, 'bolt, bar, riegel,' and compared it with *Loki*, the name of the evil god in Norse Mythology, which he connected with ON. *lúka*, 'claudere.' Grendel would, according to this view of his name, be a being which 'shuts in, incloses.' A similar use of Germ. *riegel* occurs in *höllriegel*, 'devil.' Much has been made of this interpretation by later critics. Müllenhoff<sup>24</sup> supports Grimm's comparison of Grendel with *Loki* by suggesting that the former represents, approximately, the same idea which in the Norse Mythology is distributed over the latter and his offspring, the *Miðgarðsormr* and the *Feunirsúlfr*. To Müllenhoff Grendel is the giant-like god or demon of the sea. Even to-day people say, "die Nordsee ist eine mordsee." Thousands of lives were destroyed by its onslaughts and only a god could bring help against them. Grendel is the sea in its terrible attacks upon a coast still unprotected by dykes. *Beowulf* (in the "original" myth it was a god) appears in their midst as a savior and liberator. He fights with the "monster," and wounded it falls back to die in its bed. But another wave again wells forth over the land, and this wave is Grendel's mother. The god now descends to the depths of the sea where he grapples with the deep itself and wins a second victory. When he ascends the sea is wholly calm (*wæron yðgeblond eal gefælsod*, 1621).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Wülcker, *Grundr. z. Gesch. d. ags. Lit.*, p. 259.

<sup>24</sup> *ZfdA.*, vol. VII, p. 423, and *Beowulf*, pp. 3 ff.

*Beowulf*'s fight with the Grendel monsters is therefore, according to Müllenhoff, deeply symbolic of the long struggle of Northern coast-dwellers against the sea until it must finally yield to their control. His interpretation has been widely accepted with modifications that are of no great importance. Grimm has been followed by E. H. Meyer,<sup>25</sup> who draws very subtle meanings out of the "bolt and bar" idea, as we may conveniently call it: "Grendel, d. i. riegel, an. *grindill* sturm,"<sup>26</sup> der das später in Heorots met verwandelte regennass absperrende oder raubende frühlingsturm, und seine grauliche mutter, die finstere wetterwolke, sind zu meerwölfen, der wetterleuchtende wolkenhimmel ist zur feurigem meerhalle geworden, vgl. Ymir und seine grossmutter."<sup>27</sup>

An interpretation similar in principle to Müllenhoff's is that of Uhland,<sup>28</sup> who considered the two monsters to mean "die plagen einer versumpften und verpesteten meeresbucht." Laistner<sup>29</sup> expanded this theory into an elaborate and interesting discussion. The noxious and sickening vapors that arose from the swamps and moors were dispersed only by the gradual cultivation of the land. Grendel is the malarial fever which infests all swamp districts. Some support to this theory is given by Sarrazin,<sup>30</sup> and especially by Kögel<sup>31</sup> who accepts it with a great deal of confidence and enlarges upon it with several interesting details, profiting by the interpretations of both Müllenhoff and Laistner. He finally cites from *mdl. Wb.* II, 2129,<sup>32</sup> the entry *grindel id est slanghe* (there is also, he says, "noch eine weitere jedoch weniger sichere stelle"), which he would apply to the name *Grendel*: "Das wort gehört zu *grindan*,<sup>33</sup> 'knirschen, zischen, brausen.' Dass

<sup>25</sup> *Germ. Myth.*, p. 299.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Sarrazin, *Beowulf-Studien*, p. 65.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Sarrazin, *Beowulf-Studien*, p. 65; Golther, *Germ. Mythologie*, p. 172 f.; Mogk, in Paul's *Grundriss*, I, p. 1043.

<sup>28</sup> *Germania*, vol. II, p. 349 f.

<sup>29</sup> Wülcker, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

<sup>30</sup> *Beowulf-Studien*, p. 65.

<sup>31</sup> *ZfdA.*, vol. XXXVII, p. 274 f.

<sup>32</sup> This has not been accessible to me.

<sup>33</sup> So Ettmüller, cf. Wülcker, *op. cit.*, p. 261, but see foot-note; Skeat, *Journal of Philology*, vol. XII, pp. 120-131, accepts this etymology and attempts to identify the two monsters with two bears.



wasserfluten unter dem bilde einer schlange mythisch vorgestellt werden, lässt sich auch sonst beobachten, ich erinnere nur an die lernäische hydra und an den Miðgarðsormr."<sup>34</sup>

Other discussions of the name and meaning of Grendel need not be reviewed here.<sup>35</sup> In regard to the etymology suggested by Grimm it may be said that its weakness was apparent already to Grimm himself, for he says, "keine ahd. *krentil* kenne ich." No form \**grandil*, 'bolt, bar, riegel,' has been found in any Germanic language. The word *grindel* does not seem to have been used in the same way as *riegel* in *höllriegel*, 'devil,' and nothing speaks in favor of the etymology as a whole. Kögel's citation of MLG. *grindel id est slanghe* does not prove what it is intended to prove. It occurs only in a gloss and not in a context which requires for the word *grindel* the meaning 'snake' or 'serpent.' There is, moreover, great likelihood that the word *slanghe* is due to a mistake, at some time, either in the writing or printing of the word *stanghe*, 'pole, bar,' etc., for '*stanghe*' (the word is MLG.) is precisely what we should expect *grindel* to mean.<sup>36</sup>

So far as I am able to judge no satisfactory explanation of the etymology and meaning of the name *Grendel* has yet been given. I shall therefore venture to suggest a source for this name which has already been rendered possible by the conclusion which has been reached with respect to *Bēanstān* and *Breca*. *Grendel* is, of course, from an earlier form \**grandil*, not from \**grendil*, for a Prim. Germanic *e* before a nasal must become *i*,

<sup>34</sup> Farther on, *ibid.*, p. 270, Kögel says: "Nur so (*Bēaw*, *Bēow*) hiess der inguäische *Ἡρακλῆς*, der den Grendel erlegte, die lernäische schlange des nordens."

<sup>35</sup> Little or no attention has been given to Arnold's (*Beowulf*, Lond., 1876, p. 231) mention of ME. *gryndel*, 'angry'; see also Grein, *Sprachschatz*, s. v. *grandor-lēas*.

<sup>36</sup> So I conjectured and wrote nearly two years ago after having read Kögel's article at the Newberry Library in Chicago. A short time ago I had occasion to look up the same article in our own library. Our set of *Zeitschrift f. d. Altertum* formerly belonged to the late Professor P. J. Cosijn, and in a marginal note over against *slanghe* this scholar has written "l. *stanghe* Engl. St. 21, 446." My conjecture has, therefore, been strongly corroborated. Boer, *Ark. f. nord. Filologi*, vol. xix, p. 20, accepts the gloss in good faith; cf. also Binz, *Beitr.*, vol. xx, p. 157, foot-note.

cf. OE. *bindan*: *helpan*. \**Grandil* may without difficulty be derived from the Latin adjective *grandis*, 'large, huge,' and its use as the name of a huge monster may be due to the Latin source of the Grendel fable, for in such a source this monster may have been most naturally described as *grandis*, 'huge, monstrous.' The stem of the word is Latin, the ending has been Anglicised. *Grendel* is, therefore, so far as form and meaning are concerned, a close parallel to *stengel*, 'macht habend, herrscher, strong chief,' *Bēowulf* 3116, which is an expansion by the suffix *-il(a)* of the adjective *strang*, *strong*, 'strong, mighty.' Just as *stengel* means 'the strong one,' so *Grendel* means 'The Huge One, The Monstrous One.'

If the name *Grendel* contains the Latin word *grandis*, what, then, is the source of the Grendel fable? If it had been preserved to us, it would probably have been pointed out long ago. But it may still be possible to identify a story although it may at the same time not be possible to point out its source in volume or manuscript. I therefore confine myself to a comparison of this fable with a well-known classical story with which it has several striking points of similarity.

The usual form of the story concerning the Lernæan hydra attributes to this monster a hundred, fifty, nine, or seven heads. She dwells in a swamp at Lerna near Argos in Greece, from whence she issues to devastate the neighboring territory. Hercules comes to give her battle, but before he can kill her, a gigantic crab comes to her assistance and bites him in the leg, but the crab is slain by him, and Hercules again gives his attention to the hydra. With a sickle (or a sword) he cuts off some of her heads, but for every head cut off two new ones spring forth in its place. Iolaus, the charioteer, brings firebrands with which Hercules sears the wounds so that no new heads may grow forth. He at last cuts off the one immortal head of the hydra and places upon it a huge stone. He dips his arrows in the gall of the hydra and they forthwith become poisonous.

Important correspondences exist between this fable and the story of Grendel in the *Bēowulf*. There are two monsters and they dwell in a swamp. Grendel issues forth at night, destroys men and renders a house uninhabitable. The hydra devastates the neighborhood about her. Hercules and

Bēowulf are similar figures, they both hear of the scourge and come in order to slay it. Both Grendel and the hydra are in their own way endowed with invulnerability, which, however, the hero overcomes in each case. The gall of the hydra renders arrows poisonous, the blood of Grendel melts a sword.

There are, of course, differences between the classical and the *Bēowulf* monsters, and the question arises whether these are of sufficient importance to render connection between them improbable. The monstrous crab, usually mentioned without descriptive details, does not survive as a crab, but "levelling" may here easily have taken place. Instead of a hydra and a crab we have two hydras, the hydra being the dominating figure. It will be objected that Grendel and Grendel's mother are not two hydras, for the hydra is a many-headed serpent while the former have human shape in so far as it is possible to determine their shape from the extremely vague descriptions in the *Bēowulf*;<sup>37</sup> and it may also be urged that the Lernean hydra had no cave at the sea-bottom. But I cannot consider these things as of very great importance. In the First Vatican Mythograph (6th or 7th century<sup>38</sup>) we read indeed as follows: "Hydra fuit in Lerna, Argivorum palude, serpens, quinquaginta habens capita, vel, ut quidam dicunt, septem, qui omnem regionem devorabat. Quod cum audisset Hercules, adiens eum expugnabat,"<sup>39</sup> etc. But in the Second Vatican Mythograph the version is not so clear: "Lerna palus fuit, in qua hydra bestia erat, L capita habens," etc.<sup>40</sup> In this passage no word clearly indicates that the hydra is a serpent, for the word *hydra* is here explained by the more

familiar *bestia*, not by the surely just as familiar *serpens*. So far as the conception of the monster is concerned the transition from the words *in qua hydra bestia erat* to *in qua bestia erat* or *in qua bestia grandis erat* is a very easy one. The many-headedness of the hydra in the usual conception of her does not correspond with the half-human figures of the Bēowulf. But the reason for this discrepancy may perhaps be sought in the fact that the hydra was often, in classical sources,<sup>41</sup> confused with Echidna, its mother. That Grendel's mother may in part represent Echidna will possibly explain the relationship which exists between the two monsters, Echidna being a prolific mother of monsters. I shall here quote, in a translation, Hesiod's description of Echidna and her brood, which gives us a very close picture of a monster of the type of Grendel and Grendel's mother:<sup>42</sup>

Another monster [Ceto] bare anon  
In the deep-hollow'd cavern of a rock;  
Stupendous, nor in shape resembling aught  
Of human or of heavenly: monstrous, fierce,  
Echidna: half a nymph, with eyes of jet  
And beauty-blooming cheeks: and half, again,  
A speckled serpent, terrible and vast,  
Gorged with blood-banquets, trailing her huge folds  
Deep in the hollows of the blessed earth.  
There in the uttermost depth her cavern is  
Beneath a vaulted rock: from mortal men,  
And from immortal gods, alike, remote:  
There have the immortal gods allotted her to dwell  
In mansions rumored wide. So pent beneath  
The rocks of Arima, Echidna dwelt  
Hideous; a nymph immortal, and in youth  
Unchanged for evermore. But legends tell  
That with the jet-eyed maid Tiphæon mix'd  
His fierce embrace; a whirlwind rude and wild;  
She filled with love, gave children to the light  
Of an undaunted strain: and first she bore  
Orthos, the watch-dog of Geryon's herds;  
And next, a monstrous birth, the dog of hell:  
Blood-fed, and brazen-voiced, and bold, and strong,  
The fifty-headed Cerberus: third she gave  
To birth the dismal hydra, Lerna's pest;  
Whom Juno, white-armed goddess, fostering reared  
With deep resentment fraught, insatiable,  
Gainst Hercules: but he, the son of Jove,

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Schemann, *Die Synonyma im Beowulf-liede*, Hagen, 1882, pp. 7 ff.; cf. also the following passage (1350 ff.):

þæra oðer wæs,  
þæs þe hīe gewislicost gewitan meahton,  
idese onlicnes, oðer earm-sceapen  
on weres wæstmum wræc-lāstas træd,  
næfne hē wæs mārā þonne ænig man oðer;  
þone on gēar-dagum Grendel nemdon  
fold-būende.

<sup>38</sup> Bugge, *Studier over de nordiske Gude- og Heltesagns Oprindelse*, p. 248.

<sup>39</sup> *Mythographi Vaticani*, ed. Bode, I, 62.

<sup>40</sup> Bode, II, 163.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. *Metamorphoses*, IX, 67 ff., where Hercules is represented as referring to his fight with the "Lernean Echidna"; Cicero, *Poet. Tusc.*, 2, 9, 22; and see the Latin dictionaries.

<sup>42</sup> *Theog.*, II. 295-318; translated by C. E. Elton, London, 1894 (II. 360-392).

Named of Amphitryon, in the dragon's gore,  
 Bathed his un pitying steel, by warlike aid  
 Of Iolaus, and the counsels high  
 Of Pallas the despoiler.

The cave of Echidna, when brought into the story of the hydra, could easily become a cave under the water instead of beneath a rock. In *Bēowulf* 104 ff. it is said of Grendel that he had inhabited the moors, the swamp, the home of monsters, "since the time when the creator had banished him" (*siððan him scyppend forserifen hæfde*). This reminds one of the banishment of Echidna as described by Hesiod in the above passage:

from mortal men

And from immortal gods, alike, remote:  
 There have the immortal gods allotted her to dwell  
 In mansions rumored wide.

The connection of Grendel with Cain (l. 107 f.) is also, I believe, in part due to the similarity between the banishment of Echidna (-hydra) from the sight of the gods and the banishment of Cain from the sight of God. In *Bēowulf* 111 ff. all monsters, the *eotenas*, the elves, the *orenēas*, and the giants (*gīgantas*), who fought against God (the gods), are derived from the race of Cain. Here Cain seems to have usurped the place which properly belongs to Grendel's mother, for in the above passage from Hesiod and also elsewhere Echidna is represented to be the mother of several of the monsters of classical mythology. She is the mother of Chimæra, the Sphinx, the Nemean Lion, the dragons which guard the apples of the Hesperides and the Golden Fleece, and of Scylla.<sup>43</sup> Of her it could most truly have been said: *panon untýdras ealle onwōcon* (l. 111).

In short, the type of a monster represented by Grendel and Grendel's mother in the *Bēowulf* is so much like the Echidna-hydra conception, that the latter may well be their prototype.<sup>44</sup> No Germanic conception of a monster is in as close agreement with that found in *Bēowulf* as the foreign one just discussed. This accounts not only for the general conception, but also for a number of

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Hyginus, *Fabulae*, cll.

<sup>44</sup> In Roscher, *Lexicon*, s. v. *Herakles*, p. 2243, mention is made of late Roman art-remains upon which the Hydra is represented "als weib mit zwei schlangenbeinen," or "als schlange mit einem weiblichen kopf."

important details.<sup>45</sup> I shall reserve for a future occasion a closer examination and a more thorough discussion of the classical conception of Echidna and Hydra, and the Grendel episode in the *Bēowulf*.

### III.

It has been shown that *Bēanstān* is a translation of *Oceanus*, and that the name *Grendel* probably contains a most obvious Latin epithet descriptive of a huge monster. I shall now point out another curious example of translation, which will also serve to show how far the *Bēowulf* is from unsophisticated popular poetry. The *Gēats* are sometimes called *Weder-Gēatas* (1493, 2552) or *Wederas*<sup>46</sup> (225, 341, 423, etc., but always in the gen. pl. form *Wedera*), and their country is called *Weder-mearc* (298). The origin of this name has not been understood, and many grave errors have arisen in consequence.

It is generally agreed<sup>47</sup> that *Weder-*, *Wederas*, is identical with OE. *weder*, 'wind, storm.' Fahlbeck<sup>48</sup> and Bugge,<sup>49</sup> who agree on this interpretation of the word, argue that it does not suit Vestergötland in the south-western part of Sweden, but that it admirably describes Jutland, the land of the Jutes.<sup>50</sup> Hence, and for other reasons, the *Gēatas* of *Bēowulf* are not the people of Vestergötland, but the Jutes of Jutland. Jutland is exposed to winds and storms, but Vestergötland is chiefly an inland province. It is further urged that the *ēalond ūtan* (l. 2335), which the dragon devastates with its fire, must refer to an island of some size and importance near the land of the

<sup>45</sup> In Hercules' contest with Achelous the latter, transformed into a bull, loses one of his horns, which is torn out by the roots. In the Grendel episode the arm and shoulder of the monster is torn off by *Bēowulf*. This feature can not be paralleled by numerous stories of hands or arms cut off by the sword. Classical influence is possible.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. OE. *Hrēða*, gen. pl., from *Hrēðgotan*; Latin *Visi*, sg. *Vesius*, with the same meaning as *Wisigothae*, Bugge, *Home of the Eddic Poems*, p. 158.

<sup>47</sup> I pass over such guesses as Thorpe's, *Beowulf*, Index, p. 318, cf. Müllenhoff, *Beowulf*, p. 13.

<sup>48</sup> 'Beovulfsquädet såsom källa för nordisk fornhistoria,' *Antiquarisk Tidskrift för Sverige*, vol. VIII, p. 41.

<sup>49</sup> "Jutland må med skäl kunna kallas Vindmark" (= *Wedermeare*), Fahlbeck, *ibid.*



Gēats, say Fyen (Fahlbeck<sup>50</sup>), or that it is itself the land of the Gēats, namely Jutland (Bugge). Moreover, the fact that the Gēats are called *Sægēatas* (1851, 1987) does not agree with the fact that Vestergötland had very little sea-coast, and that the West-Gēats were essentially an inland people. I cannot here give a full summary of the arguments on both sides; suffice it to say that scholars are divided upon this question into two groups, of which the one considers Bēowulf to be a West-Gēat, and the other, a Jute.

I think it can be shown that Bēowulf was neither a West-Gēat nor a Jute, but that he was really an East-Gēat, and that the *Weder-Gēatas* of Bēowulf are the people of Östergötland. *Weder-Gēatas* is, I believe, simply a translation of Latin *Austro-Gautae*, the translator having connected *Austro-* etymologically with Latin *Auster*, 'a south wind,' which in Latin poetry is synonymous with 'storm' and 'bad weather.' Cf. *Auster imbricus*, *spiritus Austri imbricator*, *auster fulmine pollens*, *auster validus, vehemens, nubilus, humidus, pluvius, frigidus, hibernus*.<sup>51</sup> The *Weder-Gēatas* are therefore the *Austro-Gautae* and Bēowulf is an East-Gēat.<sup>52</sup>

Much has been made of the point that Bēowulf makes the journey by sea from his own country to Denmark in one day (l. 219), but the importance of such an estimate of distance has certainly been exaggerated, for we can not assume that the poet (or whoever was responsible for the estimate) spoke from actual experience or knowledge. The knowledge that the *Weder-Gēatas* are the East-Geats will help to explain several things not clear before. The *ēalond ūtan* (2335) may be Öland, an island close to the eastern coast of Sweden. Perhaps the word *ēalond* might be printed as a proper name. I think there is no great likelihood that the island Gotland was meant, for this is far out near the middle of the Baltic. Öland may have been counted as part of Östergötland in the fifth and sixth centuries. During the Middle Ages it

was probably under the law of Östergötland.<sup>53</sup> At any rate, one must not judge of the location of the southern boundary of Östergötland in early heathen times by that of the modern province. The name *Sæ-Gēatas* does not point to Jutland or the island Gotland as the home of the Gēats, nor does the fact that Gēats and Swedes are represented as carrying on war *ofer sē* prove that they were far apart with a considerable body of water between them. It may be taken for granted that they carried on naval operations to a considerable extent on the Baltic. That they may have travelled and fought by sea is not more strange than the fact that Harald Hårfagr in 872 won his supremacy over the district kings of Norway in a great naval battle at Hafs fjord: *ofer sē* may be taken to refer to the conventional mode of travel and of war.

In his swimming-match with Breca Bēowulf is said to have reached *Finna lond* (580), the land of the Finns. I see no good reason why this should not be taken to refer to the present Finland, and the guesses on Finheden, Fyen, the land of Finn in Friesland, and Finmarken in northern Norway, may all be set aside as equally improbable. By the identification of the *Weder-Gēats* with the East-Gēats a very close relation is also shown to exist between the swimming-match in *Bēowulf* and that in *Egils saga ok Ásmundar*.<sup>54</sup> Egil was born in *Gautland* and *rēð fyrir Smáland-um*. "Dennoch heisst es dass er in Gautland wohnte, weil nämlich die bewohner mehrerer gegenden dem gesetze der Östgoten gehorchten." Against the opinion of Bugge, who further says, "Ursprünglicher ist offenbar die im Beowulf-gedichte vorkommende sagenform, dass der held aus Jütland in die offene see hinaus schwimmt," it may now be said that there is a remarkably close agreement between the two versions of the story with respect to its localization. It is not possible to decide in favor of Jutland as the home of Bēowulf on the basis of the name

<sup>50</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 40.

<sup>51</sup> See the dictionaries.

<sup>52</sup> Jordanes, *Get.* iii, 21-24, mentions the *Gauthi* = 'Gēats,' *Ostro-gothae*, here 'East-Gēats,' and the *Virgauthi* = \**Visigauti*, 'West-Gēats,' cf. Paul's *Grundr.* 2, iii, p. 830.

<sup>53</sup> "Öland bildade under medeltiden ett helt för sig: det hade egen lagman, men antagligen östgotalag (i Linköping gick enligt landslagen nyvald konung ed inför alla östgötar och öländingar)"—*Svensk Familiebok*, s. v. Öland.

<sup>54</sup> See Bugge, *Beitr.*, vol. xii, pp. 51 ff.

\**Heaðo-rēamas* (so plausibly corrected from *Heaðorames*, cf. *Heaðo-Rēamum*, *Widsið.* 63), which has been identified with *Raumariki* in the southern part of Norway.<sup>55</sup> It is possible that this name may also have originated in a translation of a foreign name.<sup>56</sup>

SIVERT N. HAGEN.

*The University of Iowa.*

### GALDOS'S ELECTRA.

In view of the importance of Galdós's play *Electra*, as a social and literary document, the following remarks may not be without interest, as supplementary to those made by Mr. R. E. Bassett in his review (published in *Mod. Lang. Notes* for Jan., 1904, pp. 15-17) of Mr. O. G. Bunnell's edition of the play.

On comparing the text as given by Mr. Bunnell with the text of the original edition, we note seven omissions. Two of these Mr. Bunnell may have considered necessary if the book were to be used in a mixed class. Opinions differ as to the conditions under which expurgation becomes necessary, and, indeed, as to whether it should ever be permitted; but it seems to me that even these omissions are uncalled for if the students in a mixed class be old enough to read intelligently a play with a clerical problem. The other five omissions most seriously affect the plot, since the one point that Galdós wishes to emphasize is entirely lost. In *Doña Perfecta* his point was that bigotry and fanaticism would lead one to murder; in *Electra* it is that they will lead one to lying. Let us proceed to the omissions.

At the opening of Act I, Scene 2, (Bunnell, p. 11; Madrid ed., pp. 12, 13) we find the Marques de Ronda in conversation with his friend Don Urbano García Yuste concerning *esa niña encantadora . . . esa Electra*, whom Don Urbano and his wife Evarista have taken under their guardianship. They are rehearsing also the history of Electra's mother, Eleuteria.

<sup>55</sup> See Bugge, *ibid.*, p. 55.

<sup>56</sup> A second instalment of this article will appear in the next number of this Journal.

DON URBANO. No sabía . . . Yo jamás me traté con esa gente. Eleuteria, por la fama de sus desórdenes, se me representaba como un ser repugnante . . .

MARQUES. Por Dios, mi querido Urbano, no extreme usted su severidad. Recuerde que Eleuteria, á quien llamaremos *Electra I*, cambió de vida . . . Ello debió de ser hacia el 88 . . .

DON URBANO. Por ahí . . . Su arrepentimiento dió mucho que hablar. En San José de la Penitencia murió el 95 regenerada, abominando de su *libertinaje horrible, monstruoso* . . .

Mr. Bunnell has suppressed the last three words in italics and has substituted for them the one word *pasado*. He allows the students to use their imagination as to what that 'past' was, whereas Galdós leaves no doubt in one's mind as to the character of Eleuteria. The editor did not suppress, from the page preceding the passage just quoted, a sentence of which his suppression is but explanatory: *Esta niña, cuyo padre se ignora, se crió junto á su madre hasta los cinco años.*

This drama is aimed at clericalism in general, but in particular it is against the Regulars, and Jesuitical influence. The sinister character of the play is one Pantoja, the friend and counsellor in the home of Don Urbano. He is a lay-Jesuit, fanatical and bigoted. His subtle influence pervades the household. His every wish is gratified. His keen eye sees everything. He performs his duty, as he considers it, no matter what the cost. Even truth is sacrificed to the fulfilment of his pernicious ends. Every word that comes from the mouth of Pantoja, then, is for a purpose, and Galdós certainly meant no one to tamper with his text. Pantoja believes himself to be the father of Electra, and considers that for this reason he has a supreme right to direct her actions and *llevarla por el camino del bien*. We learn, in Act IV, Scene 6, what he wishes to accomplish. The dialogue is between him and Doña Evarista. Electra is in love with her cousin Máximo, a young widower with two children. Her marriage with him would entirely upset Pantoja's plans for her. His object is to have her enter the convent of San José de la Penitencia (the same in which her mother died) there to have her character formed, and later to become Superior and under his direction govern the Congregation. But there is another reason why Pantoja wishes to cloister

Electra: it is in order that she may work out the salvation of those whose evil passions have brought her into the world. It is a black, selfish desire, but to Pantoja's distorted mind it is the only way in which he and Eleuteria can secure God's pardon. Pantoja refers to Eleuteria and says (Bunnell, p. 108; Madrid ed., p. 216):

PANTOJA. Sí: cuando su desgraciada prima de usted entró en aquella casa, mi protección no sólo fué más positiva, sino más espiritual. Nunca ví á Eleuteria después de convertida, pues de nadie, ni aun de mí mismo, se dejaba ver. Pero yo iba diariamente á la iglesia y platicaba en espíritu con la penitente, considerándola regenerada, como lo estaba yo. Murió la infeliz, á los cuarenta y cinco años de su edad. Gestioné el permiso de sepultura en el interior del edificio, y desde entonces protegí más la Congregación, la hice enteramente mía, porque en ella reposaban los restos de la que amé. *Nos había unido el delito, y ya nos unía el arrepentimiento, ella muerta, yo vivo . . .*

The speech closes in Galdós with points of suspension. Mr. Bunnell omits the sentence in italics. A little later we hear Pantoja murmur (Bunnell, p. 109; Madrid ed., p. 217):

PANTOJA. ¡Oh! sí . . . Allí reposarán también mis pobres huesos. (*Con gran vehemencia.*) Quiero, además, que así como mi espíritu no se aparta de aquella casa, en ella resida también, por el tiempo que fuera menester, el espíritu de Electra . . . No la forzaré á la vida claustral; pero si probándola, tomase gusto á tan hermosa vida y en ella quisiese permanecer, creería yo que Dios me había concedido los favores más inefables. *Allí las cenizas de la pecadora redimida, allí mi hija, allí yo, pidiendo á Dios que á los tres nos dé la eterna paz. Y cuando llegue la muerte, los tres reposando en la misma tierra, todos mis amores conmigo, y los tres en Dios . . .* ¡Oh, qué fin tan hermosa, qué grandeza y qué alegría!

The stage direction is in italics in the original. The other passage in italics represents Mr. Bunnell's omission. If there is one scene in the drama more important than all the rest it is, to my mind, Scene 8 of Act IV, and it is here that we find the most important omissions. The very passage which caused the Spanish Theatre to rise in mass and cry *Mueran los Jesuitas! Abajo el clericalismo!* is omitted by the editor. Pantoja and Electra are alone for a short conversation that Electra has granted him. Pantoja tries in several ways to persuade Electra to give up her marriage with Máximo, but the girl is unconvinced by all

his arguments. With defeat staring him in the face, he makes one last effort. It is at this point that we learn the true character of Pantoja and it is here that Galdós reaches the climax in the exposition of his thesis: that bigotry and fanaticism will lead one even to the point of telling a lie *ad majorem Dei gloriam*. (Bunnell, pp. 115, 116; Madrid ed., pp. 230-234). The passages enclosed in square brackets ([ ]) represent the omissions made by Mr. Bunnell in the following long citation.

PANTOJA. Lázaro Yuste, sí . . . Al nombrarle, tengo que asociar su triste memoria á la de una persona que no existe . . . muy querida para tí . . .

ELECTRA. (*Comprendiendo y no queriendo comprender.*) ¡Para mí!

PANTOJA. Persona que no existe, muy querida para tí. (*Pausa. Se miran.*)

ELECTRA. (*Con terror, en voz apenas perceptible.*) ¡Mi madre! (*Pantoja hace signos afirmativos con la cabeza.*) ¡Mi madre! (*Atónita, deseando y temiendo la explicación.*)

PANTOJA. Han llegado los días del perdón. Perdonemos.

ELECTRA. (*Indignada.*) ¡Mi madre, mi pobre madre! No la nombran más que para deshonrarla . . . [y la denigran los mismos que la envilecieron.] (*Furiosa.*) Quisiera tenerlos en mi mano para deshacerlos, para destruirlos, y no dejar de ellos ni un pedacito así.

[PANTOJA. Tendrías que empezar tu destrucción por Lázaro Yuste.

ELECTRA. ¡El padre de Máximo!

[PANTOJA. El primer corruptor de la desgraciada Eleuteria.

ELECTRA. ¿Quién lo asegura?

[PANTOJA. Quien lo sabe.

ELECTRA. ¿Y? (*Se miran. Pantoja no se atreve á explicar su idea.*) ]

PANTOJA. ¡Oh, triste de mí! . . . No debí, no, no debí hablarte de esto. Diera yo por callarlo, por ocultártelo, los días que me quedan de vida. Ya comprenderás que no podía ser . . . Mi cariño me ordena que hable.

ELECTRA. (*Angustiada.*) ¡Y tendré yo que oírlo!

PANTOJA. He dicho que Lázaro Yuste fué . . .

ELECTRA. (*Tapándose los oídos.*) No quiero, no quiero oírlo.

PANTOJA. Tenía entonces tu madre la edad que tú tienes ahora: diez y ocho años . . .

ELECTRA. (*Airada, rebelándose.*) No creo . . . Nada creo.

PANTOJA. Era una joven encantadora, [que sufrió con dignidad aquel grande oprobio . . .]

ELECTRA. (*Rebelándose con más energía.*) ¡Cállese usted! . . . No creo nada, no creo . . .

[PANTOJA. Aquel grande oprobio, el nacimiento de Máximo.



[ELECTRA. (*Espantada, descompuesto el rostro, se retira hacia atrás mirando fijamente á Pantoja.*) ¡ Ah . . . !

[PANTOJA. Procediendo con cierta nobleza, Lázaro cuidó de ocultar la afrenta de su víctima . . . recogió al pequeñuelo . . . llevóla consigo á Francia . . .

[ELECTRA. La madre de Máximo fué una francesa: Josefina Perret.

[PANTOJA. Su madre adoptiva . . . su madre adoptiva. (*Mayor espanto de Electra.*)

[ELECTRA. (*Oprimiéndose el cráneo con ambas manos.*) ¡ Horror ! El cielo se cae sobre mí . . . ]

PANTOJA. (*Dolorido.*) ¡ Hija de mi alma, vuelve á Dios tus ojos !

From this point on there are no omissions. There is no indication anywhere in the edition of Mr. Bunnell that he has omitted anything from the text as the author wrote it. Points of suspension are freely used throughout the work, but they are exact reproductions of similar points of suspension in the original, and in no way indicate that omissions have been made in the annotated edition. As it is not likely that all teachers have at hand the Madrid edition, it has seemed to me of interest to call their attention to these omissions so that they may supply them in their copies of Mr. Bunnell's edition.

JOHN D. FITZ-GERALD.

Columbia University.

#### DONNE'S COMPASSES AND WITHER'S COMPASS.

Donne's best known poem (not his best) is probably the *Valediction Forbidding Mourning*, which has pleased successive generations of readers ever since Coleridge called attention to the completeness with which the figure of the compasses is worked out. Dr. Grosart says that the metaphor is one that "only so daring an imagination as Donne would have attempted ; and the out-of-the-wayness of it is not more noticeable than the imaginativeness which glorified it." Perhaps it was this "out-of-the-wayness" that incited Donne's friend and admirer Ben to a similar metaphorical use of the compasses in his commendatory "Epistle" prefixed to Selden's *Titles of Honor* in 1614.<sup>1</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Professor Brumbaugh, of the University of Pennsylvania, reminds me that Donne makes a similar metaphorical

purpose of this note is to call attention to another probably earlier and much more striking tribute to this conceit of Donne's which has not hitherto, I think, been noticed.

In 1615 (so says Professor Arber in the *English Garner*, though Mr. Lee in the *Dictionary of National Biography* says the earliest extant print is of 1617) George Wither published an elegy entitled *Fidelia*. It consists of the laments, reproaches, and moralizings of a deserted but faithful mistress. She compares herself to the needle of a compass, her lover to a magnet :

"The dial needle, though it sense doth want,  
Still bends to the beloved Adamant.  
Lift the one up, the other upward tends ;  
If this fall down, that presently descends ;  
Turn but about the stone, the steel turns too ;  
Then straight returns, if but the other do !  
And if it stay, with trembling keeps one place,  
As if it, panting, longed for an embrace.  
So was 't with me !"

(*Garner* vi, p. 189.)

Donne wrote :

"If they be two, they are two so  
As stiff twin compasses are two ;  
Thy soul, the fix'd foot, makes no show  
To move, but doth, if th' other do.

"And though it in the centre sit,  
Yet, when the other far doth roam,  
It leans, and hearkens after it,  
And grows erect, as that comes home."

(*Chamber's edition* i, 52.)

The identity of the phrases "if [but] the other do," and in the rime-place at that, puts it, I think, beyond question that one of these passages is modeled upon the other. It looks as though one had said, "That's a fine conceit, but I can do it better. He used the draughtsman's compasses, I will use the sailor's compass ; and I will make it fit the case more elaborately even than he

use of the compasses in his *Obsequies of the Lord Harrington*, 106 ff. This was written in the same year as Jonson's *Epistle*, 1614. But it bears no likeness to Wither's figure. Carew's *To Celia, on Love's Ubiquity*, to which Professor Brumbaugh also refers me, is much later (first printed 1651). It is evidently suggested by Donne's conceit, but bears no close resemblance to it. Carew seems to have tried to combine the notions of the draughtsman's compasses, the mariner's compass, and the face of a clock, all in two lines. See Carew's *Poems*, ed. Ebsworth, p. 92.

did." The general unlikeness of the two poems makes the resemblance only the more striking.

The superiority of Donne's conceit to Wither's will not now be disputed. Wither's is perhaps almost as elaborately made out, but it lacks the glorifying "imaginativeness" of Donne's fancy. One wishes for Wither's sake—since, though it is no disgrace for a craftsman to be surpassed by his successors, it is not creditable to try to better a thing and make it worse—that the priority were his, and I have endeavored to convince myself that in this instance Donne may have followed Wither; but the probabilities are all on the other side.

Just when Wither wrote *Fidelia* we do not know. In his preface he says he has selected it for publication from "among other poems in my hand, long since penned."<sup>2</sup> If 1615 is the date of this preface, as Arber seems to say, the elegy may have been written as far back as 1610, or even before. In 1610 Wither came up to London to study law and make literary acquaintances, having already written part, at least, of his *Fair Virtue*. The tender, not to say lachrymose, elegiac note of *Fidelia*, and its extensive moralizing (a sort of prophecy of Richardson) on the evils of *mariages de convenance*, might well enough be the work of a very young poet. Donne's *Valediction* is said by Walton in his fourth (1674) edition of the *Life* to have been written in 1611, on the occasion of Donne's leaving his wife to travel in Europe with Sir Robert Drury; a date which Chambers seems to accept.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Gosse thinks it was written earlier;<sup>4</sup> but he gives no reasons for thinking so, and there is nothing in the poetic manner of it to necessitate an earlier dating. We have, then, for Donne's poem the probable date 1611, for Wither's some time "long" before 1615 (or 1617).

So far it is quite possible that *Fidelia* was written before the *Valediction*. On the other hand it may well enough have been written after. But when we consider the character and probable relation of the two men the weight is decidedly on the side of Donne's priority.

<sup>2</sup> *English Garner* vi, 172.

<sup>3</sup> *Poems of John Donne* i, 229.

<sup>4</sup> *Life and Letters of John Donne* i, 283.

Donne's was a peculiarly independent and isolated genius. He led rather than followed the fashion in the matter of "formal" satire in 1593 (giving vent, by the way, in one of his satires<sup>5</sup> to an almost savage contempt for plagiarists); and his lyric manner was all his own. Mr. Gosse finds but one faint trace of the influence of an English contemporary writer on Donne's poetic production, an allusion in one of his *Holy Sonnets* to Raleigh's famous apostrophe to Death.<sup>6</sup> We should little expect, therefore, to find him picking up a suggestion from a ms. poem of a contemporary with whom he had so little intellectual sympathy as he must have had with Wither. Besides, there is nothing to show that Donne was aware of Wither's existence. Both were students of Lincoln's Inn, and both were intimate friends of Christopher Brooke; but Donne had left the Inn some fifteen years before, and Wither did not become a student there till four years after, the date of the *Valediction*, and it does not seem likely that Wither's acquaintance with Brooke in 1611, the year after he came up to London, was such as to bring him into the same circle with Donne. Such research as I have been able to make nowhere reveals the two in personal contact. Indeed, a difference of fifteen years in age and a difference almost antipodal in poetic temper make it highly improbable that they were on such a footing as would be implied by Donne's studying Wither's verses in ms. But the friendship of both poets for Christopher Brooke, while it fails to lend plausibility to the theory that Donne copied Wither, does afford likelihood to the opposite assumption, that Wither in this case was using a feather from Donne's wing.

Brooke had been Donne's fellow student at Lincoln's Inn in their youth, when Donne wrote most of his poetry, and continued his intimate friend through after life. In 1597 Donne left the law school to take service in the household of Lord Keeper Egerton, while Brooke continued his career

<sup>5</sup> Satire II, ll. 25-30:

"But he is worst who (beggarly) doth chaw  
Others' wits' fruits, and in his ravenous maw  
Rankly digested, doth these things outspew  
As his own things," etc.

<sup>6</sup> *Life and Letters* ii, 109.

as a lawyer. No doubt Donne's fame as an original and brilliant poet was kept alive at Lincoln's Inn, largely through such literary lawyers as Brooke, and his poems handed about there in MS. Donne was merrymaking with Brooke just before he went abroad in 1611,<sup>7</sup> and may very well have given him a copy of the newly composed *Valediction* at that time. About the same time Wither, a young poet recently come up from the country to study law, would be making acquaintance among the literary men of the Inns of Court, of whom Brooke seems to have been the best known; he would soon hear Donne's name, in intimate circles, as that of the most quintessential wit and satirist of the age; and would (with the readiness in absorption of literary fashion which had marked him from the beginning, and distinguishes him so strongly from Donne) get access to a copy of Donne's verses and study them. Is it too much to suppose that the *Abuses Stript and Whipt* of 1613—belated satire, as his *Fair Virtue* was belated pastoral—owed its inception to such study of Donne's satires of twenty years before? Finally, directly or indirectly through the agency of Brooke, he would come upon a copy of this latest and most finished specimen of Donne's wit; and soon after, conceiving the plan of his *Fidelia*, would venture upon a revision of Donne's admirable conceit. If we suppose that the elegy was written in or about 1612 we still have time for the "long since penned" of the 1615 (or 1617) preface.

H. M. BELDEN.

University of Missouri.

#### A PASSAGE IN *Hermann und Dorothea*.

In reading Salomon Gessner's idyl "Daphne-Chloe," the following passage attracted my attention:

"Im<sup>1</sup> Schatten des Hollundergesträuches standen die Mädgen verborgen. Indess hob Alexis, unbewusst dass er behorcht ist, mit lieblicher Stimme diesen Gesang an. . . . Jüngst fand ich am Brunnen sie (i. e., Daphne); einen schweren

<sup>7</sup> Gosse, *Life and Letters* I, 278.

<sup>1</sup>Cp. SAL. GESSNERS *Schriften*, 5<sup>ter</sup> Theil. Zürich bey Orell, Gessner, Füsslin u. C. 1772, pp. 8-10.

Krug hatte sie mit Wasser gefüllt. Lass mich die dir zu schwere Last des Kruges nach deiner Hütte tragen. So stammelt ich: Wie bist du gütig, so sprach sie. Zitternd nahm ich den Krug, und blöde, und seufzend, den Blick zur Erde geschlagen, gieng ich an Daphnens Seite, und durft ihr nicht sagen, dass ich sie liebe, mehr als die Biene den Frühling liebt. . . . Ach, wenn sie meine Liebe verschmäht, dann werdet ihr, ihr Blumen, ihr mannigfaltigen Pflanzen, bisher meine Freude, meine süsseste Sorge, dann werdet ihr ungepflegt alle verwelken; denn für mich blüht keine Freude mehr."

This forms an interesting parallel to Goethe's "Hermann und Dorothea," VII, 108-111, 129-130, and IV, 212-217. In the seventh canto, we read:

V. 108: Schweigend nahm sie darauf die beiden Krüge  
beim Henkel,  
Stieg die Stufen hinan, und Hermann folgte der  
Lieben.  
Einen Krug verlangt' er von ihr, die Bürde zu  
teilen.  
"Lasst ihn," sprach sie; "es trägt sich besser die  
gleichere Last so."

V. 129: Also sprach sie und war mit ihrem stillen Begleiter  
Durch den Garten gekommen. . . .

And in the fourth:

V. 212: "Ja, sie ist's! und führ' ich sie nicht als Braut  
mir nach Hause  
Heute noch, ziehet sie fort. . . .  
Mutter, ewig umsonst gedeiht mir die reiche  
Besitzung  
Dann vor Augen; umsonst sind künftige Jahre  
mir fruchtbar.  
Ja, das gewohnte Haus und der Garten ist mir  
zuwider."

Düntzer in his "Erläuterungen" to "Hermann und Dorothea" (7<sup>te</sup> Auflage, Leipzig, 1897) refers in the foot-note, on p. 124, to the "ähnlichen und doch so verschiedenen Brunnenszene am Anfange von 'Werthers Leiden.'" (Hatfield in his edition of the poem quotes in his notes to VII, 110-112, an English version of the passage here mentioned.) It is to be found under the date "Am 15 Mai:" Letzthin kam ich zum Brunnen und fand ein junges Dienstmädchen, das ihr Getäsz auf die unterste Treppe gesetzt hatte, und



sich umseh, ob keine Kamerädin kommen wollte, ihr es auf den Kopf zu helfen. Ich stieg hinunter und sah sie an.—Soll ich Ihr helfen, Jungfer? sagte ich.—Sie ward roth über und über.—O nein, Herr! sagte sie.—Ohne Umstände.—Sie legte ihren Kringen zurecht und ich half ihr. Sie dankte und stieg hinauf.

The motive is the same in all three passages, the situation however also strikingly similar in Gessner's idyl and "Hermann und Dorothea."

M. BLAKEMORE EVANS.

University of Wisconsin.

#### INTERPRETATION OF A DISPUTED PASSAGE IN *Goetz von Berlichingen*.

In annotating the phrase "auf die Fastnacht" in the speech of Lerse, Act III, Scene 6, of *Goetz von Berlichingen*: "Es wäre mir leid. Wiszt Ihr noch, wie Ihr um des Pfalzgrafen willen Konrad Schotten feind wart und nach Haszfurt auf die Fastnacht reiten wolltet?" Professor Goodrich, of Williams College, in his excellent edition (Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1899) says: "Wustmann takes *auf* with the accusative in this passage as denoting *time* in answer to the question *when*? Beer remarks 'nicht Angabe der Zeit, sondern des Zwecks.' A comparison with the passages of the *Lebensbeschreibung* (pp. 81-84) from which the incident here related is taken will furnish grounds for both views. I am on the whole inclined to agree with Wustmann."

An investigation of the above passage yielded the following result. Of some twenty editions of the drama consulted,<sup>1</sup> curiously enough only four comment upon the phrase in question, and their interpretations are at variance. Even Düntzer observes silence in reference to it in his *Erläuterungen*. H. A. Bull annotates, "Notice the accusative, because in the relation of the incident they had not yet ridden," and A. Chuquet trans-

lates in his foot-notes,—"*Pour la veille de carême, pour le carnaval.*"

The editors who endeavor to interpret the phrase, restrict themselves for a basis of their view solely to a general comparison with the passage in the *Lebensbeschreibung*, and, naturally, on so indefinite grounds, arrive at entirely dissimilar conclusions. They all seem to overlook the only possible guide the passage affords for a proper interpretation, namely, the syntactical rule of order, that adverbial phrases of time should precede other coördinate adverbial phrases. The application of that rule plainly makes this a non-temporal phrase in Goethe's drama,<sup>2</sup> while the passage in the *Lebensbeschreibung*, to which the commentators refer in substantiation of their interpretation, actually reads, in contrast to Goethe, with the opposite order "*vnnd auch vff die Fasznacht gein Haszfurt khommen*" (p. 67).

That phrases with "auf," especially in the older German, very frequently have temporal force, is of course true. The *Lebensbeschreibung* itself abounds in them. To quote only a few, we find *auff S. Laurenzentag*, p. 21 (edit. F. W. G. v. Berlichingen-Rossach); *vff S. Jacobsabend*, p. 21; *vff die Fasznacht*, p. 25; *vff S. Jörgen tag*, p. 27; *vf sonntag nach S. veitts tag*, p. 30; *vff dieselbige zeit*, p. 48; *vff den andern Summer*, p. 49; *vff vnser Frauen geburtstag*, p. 57; *vff S. Peters tag*, p. 67; *vff ein zeit*, p. 79;—all of which are plainly expressions of time. It is interesting in this connection to refer also to that mother-source of early Modern High German, Luther's translation of the Bible, for similar phrases. Luke 2, 41-42 reads: "Und seine Eltern gingen alle Jahre gen Jerusalem auf das Osterfest. Und da er zwölf Jahr alt war, gingen sie hinauf gen Jerusalem, nach Gewohnheit des Festes"; and the Gospel according to St. John 11, 56: "Was dünket euch, dasz er nicht kommt auf das Fest?" In these two passages, the phrases with "auf," both on account of the word-order and context, are unquestionably non-temporal. In other passages of exactly the same kind, *e. g.*, Matth. 26, 5; Matth. 27, 15; Mark

<sup>1</sup>I am indebted to Professors A. R. Hohlfeld, of the University of Wisconsin, and Frank Goodrich, of Williams College, for access to a portion of these editions, and desire to express my obligation to them.

<sup>2</sup>Unless we choose in this instance to assume intentional violation of grammatical usage on the part of Goethe, for which there seems to be no reasonable justification or cause.

15, 6; John 18, 39; the identical phrases perhaps equally certainly refer to time. A comparison with the Greek original, using as it does, the simple dative, *ἐν* with the dative, *κατά* with the accusative, *ἐς* with the accusative, respectively, leaves us entirely devoid of a cue as to the original meaning, and we are restricted for an interpretation to the German,—which does not always tally with the English and other translations.

We have a similar difficulty in the case of phrases with "zu," e. g., *zu Weihnachten*, *zum Geburtstag*, *zu Ostern*, *zu Michaelis*, etc. Even in phrases like *zu Weihnachten bekommen*, *zum Geburtstag schenken*, *zu Ostern geben*, they, like those with "auf," may originally, perhaps, have been more commonly temporal phrases = *zur Weihnachtszeit bekommen*, *geben*, to get or give at the time of Christmas, on the event of Christmas. Now, however, expressions like *zum Geburtstag schenken*, *zu Weihnachten bekommen*, to get for Christmas, *pour Noël*, certainly are not felt as expressions of time. These few suggestions and examples are all that occur to me at this time. It might be interesting for some one to make a more careful and exhaustive investigation on the origin, historical development, and present interpretation of these and similar expressions. The passage from *Goetz* which gave rise to this discussion, can, it seems to me, in the light of what has been said above, be given only one interpretation, namely, the non-temporal one, or that of "Zweck," as Beer says, though on wholly different grounds from any reasons he urges. It is not, as a matter of fact, an accusative of "purpose," but an accusative of "place," just as in expressions like 'auf den Markt eilen,' 'auf den Tanzboden gehen,' 'auf ein Fest kommen,' with the implied purpose, of course, of buying, dancing, celebrating. But the accusative does not express the purpose in such phrases; it is simply the local accusative.

J. B. E. JONAS.

*Brown University.*

### THE ORIGINS OF ARTHURIAN ROMANCE.

*Iwain, a study in the origins of Arthurian romance*, by A. C. L. BROWN. Boston, 1903. (Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, VIII.)

*Studies in the Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance*, by LUCY A. PATON. Boston, 1903. (Radcliff College Monographs, XIII.)

The above monographs, both dealing with practically the same theme: the fairy-mistress episode of Celtic mythology, though in different aspects, were both originally worked out as doctor's dissertations under the direction of the Modern Language departments of Harvard University. The line of investigation which they represent won general recognition a few years ago through Professor Schofield's admirable treatise on *Libeaus Desconus*. It is thus prepossessing to find his name prominently recorded among the sponsors of the present works. The first of these, which was known to be under way, has been awaited with more than ordinary interest as its author's proficiency in this field was recognized. The second by Miss Paton, though less widely heralded than the first, will be found on examination to be fully its equal in substance and workmanship.

Dr. Brown's manuscript, we are told, was sent to the printer in 1900, Miss Paton's presumably not until the fall of 1902. The former study thus antedates considerably the latter, as is apparent also from the references given by Miss Paton to the former work. Nevertheless, since Miss Paton treats the general story type of which the *Yvain*, according to Dr. Brown, is a specific example, it is convenient to consider her work first.

The Fairy Queen—and this might be a subtitle of Miss Paton's study—it seems is a figure as old as the *sids* which she was thought to inhabit. As early as the seventh century of our era she makes her appearance in Irish literature. Since then she has undergone a long series of transformations, none of which however have quite effaced her primitive Celtic character. In this early form she is essentially a supernatural being, superior to human frailty, who lures to her other world realm

only the best and most valorous of knights—destined henceforth to remain in her thrall and submit to her love. She is known in legend in three prominent manifestations: as Morgain la fée (also Arthur's sister), as the Dame du lac, and as Niniane (the later Vivien), the last two not being found outside Arthurian literature and being connected specifically with Lancelot and Merlin. Each one of these forms Miss Paton attempts to trace back to its source and forward through literature, showing how it arose and how it changed in accordance with a new age and new manners.

Lot and Rhys are responsible for the view that Morgain is originally a Celtic mermaid whom the romancers have gradually changed into a kind of 'proud damsel.' Miss Paton dissents from this view and suggests in its place that *Morgain* goes back to *Morrigan*, the name of the Irish war goddess, with whom moreover the character of Morgain has several traits in common. The bulk of Miss Paton's book is taken up in an attempt to justify this hypothesis.

The most prominent romantic figure with whom Morgain is associated is Arthur. It is curious to note that in her relations with the British king she appears to have a dual personality. Geoffrey of Monmouth and the British historians represent her as a friendly being who heals Arthur's wounds in Avalon, whereas the romances in which she figures most prominently make her Arthur's enemy and even the perpetrator of definite schemes against him. In the latter aspect she is seen above all in the *Huth Merlin*, where she actually employs Accalon to make an attempt on the king's life. Crestien de Troyes mentions in different passages of the same poem,<sup>1</sup> *Morgain la fee* and *Morgain la sage*, whom he also terms Arthur's sister. Are we here dealing with the same, or with two distinct personalities? Miss Paton, and it seems with good reason, chooses the first alternative.

The hatred of Morgain for Arthur is paralleled in Irish literature in the hatred of Morrigan for Cuchulinn, and the sagas of Arthur and Cuchulinn we know are too similar not to be in some way connected. But Arthur's stay in Avalon is

also paralleled by Cuchulinn's summons to the Other World as told in the *Conchulaind Serghlige*. In fact, the latter tale represents Cuchulinn also as opposed by his fairy mistress for seeking to break his bonds and return to mortals. It is thus easy to follow Miss Paton in her suggestion that Morgain in the original legend is a fairy mistress, who being enamored of Arthur, first attracted him to her abode as her lover and then rose in indignation against him for seeking to win back his freedom. It is impossible to trace here the various steps leading to this conclusion, or to adduce the wealth of material with which Miss Paton enforces it; suffice it to say, that her caution wins the reader's confidence from the start and that though perhaps mistaken in certain matters of detail, the evidence at her command could hardly have been put to better use.

Thus the well-known Avalon episode becomes not only a manifestation of Morgain's early love but the healing of Arthur's wounds is probably a reminiscence of an original spell which she had cast upon him and which she removes as soon as he is in her power. Further the fact that she seeks him on the field of Camlan is simply in accord with her character as a battle maiden. Geoffrey's part in the history of the tale was not to increase but to lessen its romantic character by bringing it wholly within the pale of his rationalistic mind. One of Miss Paton's best chapters<sup>2</sup> is that in which she explains the further change in Morgain's character from Arthur's mistress to Arthur's sister, by which step the division of Morgain's character into two distinct personages becomes complete. Geoffrey, Wace and Lazamon agree that Arthur had but one sister, who was married to Lot and became the mother of Gawain. In Crestien and the French prose-romances Arthur's sister is always Morgain. Now, Anna according to Irish tradition is a war-goddess easily to be confused in attribute with Morgain, and several Welsh sources give Gawain's mother epithets properly belonging to Anna.<sup>3</sup> Hence, what is more likely than that the further quality of being Arthur's sister was ascribed to Morgain, especially as she was the better known of the two

<sup>1</sup> P. 136.

<sup>2</sup> *Peredur, Kulhwch and Olwen*.

<sup>3</sup> *Erec*.



and thus more likely to attract characteristics not originally hers. This identification is actually borne out by several sources, among others Malory's *Morte Darthur*, and it is given color by the alliance in the *Huth Merlin* of Arthur and Urien, the latter of whom is married to Morgain, who thus is the mother of Yvain.

Miss Paton also establishes Morgain's relations to other romantic heroes such as Ogier, Auberon, Alisandre l'Orphelin, etc. Notable among these are Morgain's courtship of Lancelot and Guiomar as a result of her natural jealousy of Guenevere. According to the *Livre d'Artus* she is even led to build the *Val sans Retor*, from which as the name implies there is no escape. As Miss Paton points out, in many cases Morgain was brought into connection with other heroes than Arthur by the fact that Arthur had become popularly known as her brother. Thus Crestien assures<sup>4</sup> us: *ce fu veritez prouuee* that her lover was Guiomar. The absence of her name from Welsh records is explained on the ground that the Welsh still grasped its original meaning in spite of its French transcript and hence always gave it in translation. An instance of this, Miss Paton thinks, is to be seen in *Peredur* where the rôle of the *Empress* is identical with that of Morgain elsewhere. As the evidence on this point appears to be meager, it is probably here that Miss Paton's argument is most open to question.

The last chapters of this study are taken up by a discussion of the fairy types embodied in the Dame du lac and Niniane. The former is simply a fay of the Land beyond the Waves who becomes distinguishable from others of her type through her protection of Lancelot. As her efforts are in part directed against the wiles of Morgain, it is natural to find the two fays often connected in tradition. In Niniane, on the other hand, we have the Irish war-goddess again in word and deed. Niniane Miss Paton derives from Irish *Niamh*, in opposition to Rhys who thinks the name is the same as Rhiannon. The war-maiden theme is again apparent in the entombment of Merlin, which to Miss Paton's mind is the original fairy story modified to suit an enchanter instead of a knight-errant. An interesting par-

allel, which presumably has escaped Miss Paton's notice, to this and to the second part of the Morgain story (the vengeance motive) is the very distinctive Proud Damsel episode related in the *Vengeance de Raguidel*,<sup>5</sup> a version of which occurs also in the prose *Perceval*.<sup>6</sup>

One of the excursions to Miss Paton's book, of which there are four, calls attention to certain points of contact between the Fairy Mistress tale and the Diana myth. In view of the importance of this myth in throwing light on the *Yvain*, it is perhaps to be regretted that Miss Paton did not see fit to enlarge this section. Nevertheless, it is rare to find a book which when viewed as a whole gives such complete satisfaction and which is so certain to remain for a long time without a peer in its special field.

## II.

Dr. Brown's preface informs us that it is the intention of the author to "investigate the vexed question of the sources of Chrétien's *Ivain*." But that he cannot thereby mean the immediate sources<sup>7</sup> of the romance is at once apparent from the fact that the Welsh *Owein and Lunet* is left completely out of consideration. What Dr. Brown intends above all to consider is the "real nature" of the *Yvain* story. As was remarked above, he is primarily concerned with the special Celtic tale out of which the *Yvain* may have been evolved. The best critics agree that this was some kind of Fairy Mistress episode. Dr. Brown proposes to determine the particular type. We should, therefore, not look here for a detailed treatment of the French poet's literary method, nor for a characterization of the *Yvain* as a work of literature. The present study is more especially a contribution to the history of Celtic mythology than a monograph on the romance of Crestien de Troyes.

The study falls roughly into three parts. In the first part the author rediscusses and again rejects the somewhat weather-beaten theory of Professor Foerster that the kernel of the *Yvain* is the widow of Ephesus story; in the second part

<sup>5</sup> *Histoire littéraire*, vol. xxx, p. 55.

<sup>6</sup> P. 55 (ed. Potvin).

<sup>7</sup> Compare, however, p. 94, note.

<sup>4</sup> *Erec*, v. 1958.

he traces the descent of the *Yvain* from an Irish tale of the same general type as the *Cuchulaind Serglige* (cf. above); and in the third part occurrences of the type are noted in other branches of literature. The steps, as traced by him, by which the Irish tale was transformed into the French romance are somewhat as follows:

Ten of the seventeen incidents into which the *Yvain* may be divided are found more or less distinctly in the Irish prototype. Important among these are: (1) the previous visit of some other knight to the fairy realm; (2) the perilous passage thither, represented in Crestien by the falling gates; (3) the protection afforded by the lady's confidante; (4) the marriage with the lady; (5) the broken faith and madness; (6) the cure by a magic remedy. The first change in this situation was probably the substitution of a single combat for the general engagement found in the *Serglige*. This step is represented by the tale of Curoi (*Dinnshenchas*), in which Cuchulinn fights and vanquishes his lady's husband. The next stage appears in the so-called *imrama*, where though Christian influence has expunged the combat, the Other-World landscape and some of its accessories such as the 'giant herdsman' and the 'perilous passage,' here the 'island of the open door,' are developed. Professor Koelbing had pointed out that the *Navigatio Sancti Brendani*,<sup>8</sup> based on the *imrama*, contains a tree with practically the characteristics of that situated by the fountain in Crestien. Koelbing explained the similarity as borrowing by the Champagne poet. Dr. Brown discredits this theory, holding that the motive crept naturally into Crestien's source as part of a Christian paradise description to which the Celtic Other-World accounts had been made to conform. Thus, by degrees, we should have in outline the strongly rationalized story on which Crestien drew; the Celtic Other-World we know was often located under the sea and hence termed the Under-Wave Land (cf. *Lancelot*)—a notion which is faintly reflected in Crestien's fountain; the 'hospitable host' is in origin merely a creature of the fairy, sent to earth to prepare the hero's journey, and the 'giant herdsman' is another manifestation of

the fay's guardian, who has the ability to shift his shape at will. An example of what the *Yvain* might have been on Irish soil is the account in the Irish *Gilla Decair* of the eighteenth century: here we have the same fountain with its defender as in the Old French work, the chief difference being that the defender dives into it with the hero and thus reaches the land underneath. Finally there is no lack of evidence to show that *Yvain* was conceived of elsewhere as an Other-World hero, among other instances his name being linked to that of Morgain (cf. above).

All of these points, so inadequately sketched here, are adduced by the author with an evidence of deliberation and backed by a mass of material which make it impossible to judge his views without a detailed examination of the facts. Though in the main thus a definite expression of opinion must be reserved for a later date, several questions of general import can be discussed now. It seems on the whole as if a comparison of the *Yvain* with Crestien's earlier works, with a view to the poet's literary method, would have been useful, not to say essential, in determining whether he had before him one definite tale, as Dr. Brown (p. 25) assumes he chiefly had, instead of a hotchpotch of tales inextricably mingled. Such a method has proved successful in the case of *Cligés*,<sup>9</sup> why should it not in *Yvain*, where the problem is of a somewhat similar nature? The *Cligés* and the *Lancelot* were written to gratify the tastes of a précieux society; for some unknown reason, probably because it offended the poet's native bent, in *Yvain* we find the tables turned and the same précieux society ridiculed which Crestien had before taken such pains to exalt. In other words, we see him reverting to his earlier manner of the *Erec*, with an added touch of satire gained from his contact with the polite world. For it is distinctly the polite world that he naïvely holds up to scorn in the person of the great lady, Laudine: *cele qui prist celui qui son seignor ocist*. How easy it would be, remembering the poet's use of 'Solomon's Wife' in *Cligés* and his general

<sup>8</sup> *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, xi, 442-448.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the articles on Crestien de Troyes (à propos of *Cligés*) by the memorable Gaston Paris in the *Journal des Savants* for 1902 (beginning with the February number).

acquaintance elsewhere with the '*matière de Rome*,' to fall into the error of Foerster and think here of the 'Widow of Ephesus.' And then, how likely it becomes that Crestien was in reality mingling a Celtic and a Classic theme! The more so as the whole scene at the fountain with all its accompaniments of sudden rain, defender and consequent marriage, is closely paralleled by the widespread Italic Diana myth.<sup>10</sup> Even the names in a rough way bear out the analogy,<sup>11</sup> Lunete being clearly suggestive of the three-fold goddess, while Laudine may merely be a corrupted *Lá Diane* and the Dameisele Sauvage (v. 1620), of whom Dr. Brown makes no mention, a sadly perverted Silvanus. Thus it might happen that we have in *Yvain* a 'combination' of stories, the introduction of the fountain with its rain-making qualities (cf. the Grail romances with the rain in the Grail forest<sup>12</sup>) being due to a fusion in Crestien's mind of the Fairy Mistress story with a local French version of the Diana myth. That the former had a form akin to the *Huth Merlin* episode of Arthur, Morgain and Accalon, cited above, seems likely from the fact that *Escalos* in v. 1970 is *Ascalon* in mss. V. M. and S., as also in Hartmann's *Iwein*, a variant obviously identical with *Accalon* and curiously suggestive of Welsh *Kynon* (in *Owein and Lunet*). Miss Paton (p. 276) points out that Diana was regarded as the tutelary goddess of the Ardennes, a circumstance which may be reflected in Crestien's *Argone*, v. 3228. The fact that Crestien repeats himself and re-embodies his old themes in new forms will be admitted by Dr. Brown, who mentions (p. 137) the equation of the *Joie de la cour* and the *Chateau de pesme adventure*. Gawain's adventure (*Perceval*) at the Magic Castle is of the same general type, and the *Lancelot* contains a similar situation mingled with what is probably a crude re-arrangement of the 'tournament' in *Cligés*, adapted to a new tale. *Cligés*, as Gaston Paris has shown, is a revised *Tristan*; *Yvain* without doubt is a reversed *Lancelot*. Perhaps even

the *Chevalier au lion* is nothing more than the antithesis of the *Chevalier à la charrette*, a name of honor set over against a name of shame.

If there be a measure of truth in the above, it is difficult to agree with the author that Crestien was following a clearly defined *conte*. Evidently his own works were intended primarily for recitation. That he was himself just as often an auditor of others' works is very likely. His knowledge except in rare cases must have been chiefly a matter of oral tradition. Thus, and thus only, we can account for the obscurity and evident perversion of many of his episodes. Moreover, as Baist already remarks,<sup>12</sup> the *Yvain* bears the distinct stamp of popular narration. The ending (v. 6815 ff.) is to me a typical fairy-tale conclusion. Compare the "*ne ja plus n'an orroiz conter*," etc., with the end of *Aucassin et Nicolette*: "*no cantefable prent fin, n'en sai plus dire*." In only one other place does the poet mention a possible source (v. 2685), and there he is scarcely to be misunderstood: "*et dit li contes, ce me sanble*."

These are some of the reasons why, in my opinion, Dr. Brown has not definitely solved the *Yvain* question. That he has, however, advanced it a step toward that solution can not be denied. From a mechanical point of view his study leaves little to be desired. Perhaps an index, such as Index II of Miss Paton's work, would increase its usefulness for the general student of mediæval literature.

WM. A. NITZE.

Amherst College.

#### GERMAN FAIRY-STORIES.

*Kinder- und Hausmärchen* der Brüder GRIMM.

Selected and edited with an introduction, notes and a vocabulary by B. J. Vos, Associate Professor of German in the Johns Hopkins University. New York, etc.: American Book Company. [1903.]

There have been several editions of German fairy-stories, published for the use of students, before the appearance of the present volume.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, London, 1890, p. 4.

<sup>11</sup> Dr. Brown says (p. 26): "nearly all the names of the *dramatis personæ* are Celtic."

<sup>12</sup> Gautier's Continuation of the *Perceval* and the *Perlesvaus*.

<sup>12</sup> *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXI, 402-405.



One of the earliest books in this line of literature appeared in the year 1881, with notes by Mr. Wm. Archer (H. Holt & Co.). The text fills 204 closely printed pages, the notes occupy 24 pages. The book contains 42 stories; the notes at the end give "translations of the most difficult idiomatic phrases into their English equivalents." This was the only object the editor had in view; there are no explanations of the idiomatic phrases, nor is there a single reference to grammar, inflections, or syntax. Mr. Archer says: "The idiom of the German language permits the frequent use of the adverbs, *noch, doch, jetzt, einmal* and *schon*, for emphasis, but their translation into English should always be avoided, except when used to modify a verb, and even then as sparingly as possible." We are a little more conscientious about matters of this kind nowadays. The Publisher's Note reads: "The plain narrative, with its simply constructed sentences, is well adapted for the tyro." That might be so, if the tyro were aided by a vocabulary.

In 1885 there appeared a collection of fairy-tales, edited by W. H. van der Smissen (D. C. Heath & Co.). The book contains only 8 stories; the notes are more comprehensive than are those attached to Mr. Archer's publication; they also pay some attention to various grammatical difficulties. The vocabulary is helpful to the beginner, and the remarks on the construction of sentences are valuable.

Next in the order of publication we find a collection of Grimm's fairy stories (43), edited by Charles P. Otis (1887; H. Holt & Co.). This book is far superior in every way to any editions that had appeared before that time. It is not only provided with a very carefully arranged vocabulary and copious notes that are of real advantage to the student, but it includes an introduction giving some valuable information on the antiquity of the stories, the style and form of language, as well as on general mythological features that in his opinion form the background of some of the fairy-tales.

The next publication to be considered is the edition by G. Eugène Fasnacht (Macmillan & Co., 1891). It comprises but 7 stories, with vocabulary and notes. As to the latter, they amount to an interlinear translation at least as far

as the first story is concerned. It seems to us that students who must be told that *hatte* is the 3d pers. sing. pret. ind. of *haben*, or that *er* is a pers. pron. meaning *he*, or *it* if the English word is neuter, might postpone the reading of these fairy-stories until they have mastered the elements of German grammar. If they need such rudimentary instruction, how can they be expected to understand and retain idioms like *sich auf den Weg machen*, or the use of the subjunctive in indirect discourse? At the very beginning of the first story we have: *Der Esel machte sich auf den Weg nach Bremen, dort, meinte er, er könnte ja Stadtmusikant werden*. The editor has endeavored to reconcile the conflicting claims of beginners, on the one hand, and of better-trained minds, on the other. The matter, intended for beginners, contains in *larger* type "strictly elementary notes in which the repulsive terminology of grammar is carefully eschewed; whilst the supplementary Notes in *smaller* type, adapted to the wants of the more experienced, fully explain all real difficulties peculiar to German construction in general and to the quaint diction of these tales in particular." It appears to us that this method of reconciliation consists in trying to pursue two different purposes at the same time. It is not an easy task; the beginner, unless he be endowed with peculiar optic nerves, cannot help seeing the notes in *smaller* type which are just below those in *larger* type. But in this way he will behold the "repulsive terminology of grammar," as, for instance, "*guter* is the masc. sing. nom. form of *gut*, here declined strong, because it is preceded by *kein*;" this source of information, however, ought to be "carefully eschewed" by the beginner. On the other hand, supposing the beginner succeeds in closing his eyes to the *smaller* type and comes to the sentence: *Als er (der Esel) ein Weilehen fortgegangen war* (on the 8th line of the first story), he will find in the notes in *larger* type "*fortgegangen*, past part. of *fort-gehen*, 'to go away,' 'to walk on.'" As the notes in *smaller* type are intended for the advanced student only, he ought not to avail himself of the information given in this connection (in *smaller* type) that some verbs take the auxiliary *sein* and that in the past participle of a separable verb *ge* is inserted between the prefix and verb.

There is no trace of any attempt to throw light

on the peculiar and general features of the fairy-tales, or on their scientific aspects, except in a foot-note on the first page of the Preface. Applying the term "*naïveté*" to the manner in which the stories are told, the editor says: "I venture to say *naïveté* with all due deference to those who can see a solar myth lurking beneath every miraculous incident of folk-lore." We do not remember Professor Max Müller's reply to the remark.

Mr. M. Homann edited a collection of "popular German tales" with grammatical and explanatory notes in 1897 (Hachette & Co., London, Paris, Boston). There are 20 stories in the book, some of them collected by the brothers Grimm, others arranged by Ludwig Bechstein. The notes are very satisfactory, both in regard to the explanation of idiomatic phrases and in relation to grammatical forms and constructions.

The latest publication on the subject is an edition, containing 21 fairy-tales, by Professor B. J. Vos of the Johns Hopkins University. The introduction opens with a biographical sketch of the brothers Grimm; no edition of the stories ought to be without one.

The subject taken up next is the literary aspect of the *Märchen*, which includes also a consideration of such inflected forms and orders of words as are peculiar to the text. As to the scientific aspect, or the origin and antiquity of the subject matter, Professor Vos mentions and explains three different theories. According to the first one held by the Grimms and, in a general way, adopted by Professor Otis in 1887, there is an intimate connection between Teutonic mythology and the *Märchen*. Professor Vos, in common with most scholars of the present day, rejects this theory and also the second one according to which the *Märchen* originated during "the savage state of man" and by "the savage way of regarding the world." He apparently accepts the third theory: that they are Buddhistic in origin. At all events, his remarks on the subject are interesting and certainly convey all the information that can be expected from an Introduction to a text-book.

The edition contains a very good vocabulary. The stories have been arranged, as far as possible, in the order of their difficulty and this is another

point that is to be recommended. As to the Notes, opinions may differ not in regard to the value of those actually given, but as to the number of them. As Professor Vos says in his Preface that the *Märchen* are frequently taken up in the first stages of German study" some notes might have been added to the first 5 or 6 stories. We notice a few points of minor importance that may be changed in later editions. On page 49, line 17, the note says "*kam . . . dahergelaufen*. German uses the past participle with *kommen*, English the present." An instance of this construction occurred before on page 42, lines 25 and 26, "*kamen sie beide herabgeflogen*." A reference to the 'ethical' dative might also prove to be of advantage, as, for example, in "*Morgen musst du mir anfangen zu arbeiten*" on page 86. But these are, as we have just said, matters of slight consequence and we are glad to say that this is by far the best edition of the *Märchen* for school purposes that has been published.

G. T. DIPPOLD.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

#### FRENCH VERSIFICATION.

*A History of French Versification*, by L. E. KASTNER. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903. 8vo., xx and 320 pp.

Let it be said first of all that this book is a useful one, full of valuable information, handy for reference—though a complementary Index would be a welcome addition,—a book to be warmly recommended by people who wish to be introduced without too much trouble and without unnecessary details into the secrets of French versification.

This does not mean, however, that we consider the book an ideal one from all points of view.

There were two methods of approaching the subject, the analytic and the synthetic, the first giving merely facts, the second the meaning of facts. As there are relatively many points that remain unsettled in the field covered by Mr. Kastner's book, he preferred the analytic treat-

ment. Only a very short Preface, exactly two pages on The Principles of French Versification, no Conclusion, in the various chapters extremely few words given to theories—in brief, over three hundred pages of almost nothing but tabulated facts. There will be no danger, at any rate, of leading the student astray.

This seems all very sound and proper according to modern ideas of scholarship. And yet one cannot help growing suspicious of the method when it is so strictly applied. It is well to be careful, but the fear of hazardous statements ought not to paralyze us altogether. Like many good scholars of to-day, Mr. Kastner has been timid in the extreme; he has made of himself a mere cataloguer; he is altogether too modest.

Saint-Saëns, one day after studying one of Wagner's operas, said: "How I should like to be the one who did this so as to have done it otherwise." In reading Mr. Kastner's book the same thought occurred to us frequently. There are enough well-established facts in it to allow some general inferences which will throw light upon the subject, and to help us to grasp it as a whole and not as a mere heap of disconnected bits of erudition. Mr. Kastner collected the material for a building, he was afraid to start the construction. Why?

Moreover, we ought never to forget that a strictly analytical treatment is, after all, an impossibility. The mere disposition of the material in a book implies some theorizing. Mr. Kastner knew it since he put first the chapters concerning the construction of the poetical line (Syllabism, Rime, Césura), and then made another group of those concerning the 'strophe' and the whole poem. What is suggested here is, therefore, not even to introduce into the book an element that was not there before, but simply a more thorough-going and systematic application of some principle of classification. Would it not be an advantage, for instance, if the chapter on Hiatus, which deals with questions so nearly related to those of the chapter on Syllabism (*e. g.*, that of the *e* mute) were not separated from it by four others treating altogether different subjects; or, again, if the chapter on Rimeless poetry were not separated by nine others from that on Rime, to which it is a natural appendix. And this lack of order is even

more apparent in the internal arrangement of chapters, and there it is also of more consequence. For instance, on pages 121 to 122 Malherbe's ideas on hiatus are presented first, and those of the poets of the Pléiade second. This ought not to occur in a 'history' of French versification. Malherbe is apt to undertake changes or propose reforms which, to be well understood, require a knowledge of Ronsard's opinions, while the reverse is, of course, not true. On pages 100 and following, in treating of the Césura, the author quotes first the poets of the nineteenth century, who used the 5 + 5 arrangement in the decasyllabic verse, and then goes back to the Old French and comes up to the end of the eighteenth century.

A good deal of stress ought to be laid upon such things. The better the classification of facts adopted, the better the insight into the subject on the part of the readers. If a chapter is short and not too much overloaded with facts, the inconvenience is not so great; but beyond a certain limit it becomes very confusing. The second chapter, on the "Counting of Syllables" with its thirty-three pages of small details, is truly bewildering. Let us take the treatment of the mute *e*, to illustrate perfectly the deficiency which, in the mind of the reviewer, is the great shortcoming of the book.

Mr. Kastner states first the general rule, namely that *e* mute is elided before a vowel and an *h* mute. This seems a natural thing to do; and yet it leads to an unfortunate result. The impression conveyed will be that the cases in the Old French where the rule is not observed, are exceptions to our modern rule, which is, of course, not true. We may take exception to some rule prevailing in Old French, but Old French cannot take exception to a rule of later centuries. In fact, the principle came only gradually to be enforced and to assume the form of a rule. The statement of Mr. Kastner is not false, it is presented in a misleading way.

How much clearer and more lucid it would be to begin by saying, for instance: In Old French the *e* mute was elided optionally, and this very naturally, since the pronunciation was not yet fixed. As the tendency toward rule grew, the elision of the *e* gradually ceased to be optional, and when Malherbe appeared, he decided that the



*e* mute should be counted before a consonant, but not before a vowel or an *h* mute; and in this he did also no more than follow as closely as possible the rule of pronunciation in force at this time.

Seen in this light the different cases given by the author appear as mere applications of the same principles. By the method just suggested, one does not only offer a rule, but an explanation and a justification of the rule. Had the author used it he would have made his point much stronger when he speaks of the antagonism between certain rules surviving from the past, and the present pronunciation of French. He might have reached even more thoroughgoing conclusions, namely, that not only the classical rule is not perfect, but that there ought not to be any rule at all. The very best would be if each poet were allowed to use his own poetical sense in each particular case. This 'poetical sense' need in no way be taken in some metaphysical acceptance; the poet need not reason out each case before him, but the critic can find out exactly in most cases the reason why it was right that the poet should or should not apply the rule of the *e* mute. The insertion of an *e* mute in the line produces a kind of stop that may be most serviceable. Owing to the dullness of its sound, the syllable that precedes it resounds in the ear practically during the time regularly allowed for two syllables and is thus emphasized. Let us take an example, not from the free symbolists, but from the classical Corneille. The first lines of the imprecations of Camille against Rome ran thus:

Rome, l'unique objet de mon ressentiment !  
Rome à qui vient ton bras d'immoler mon amant !  
Rome, qui t'a vu naître, et que ton cœur adore !  
Rome enfin que je hais parce qu'elle t'honore !

The first Rome (two syllables) comes out much stronger than the second, which is, of course, legitimate. The word that summarizes in it the whole hatred of Camille, is thrown out ahead like a war cry with extreme force, so that the impression will last. In the second line (Rome = one syllable) this is no longer necessary, nor is it in the fourth. In the third it would be unnecessary also, but here is the point: According to Malherbe's rule, the poet whenever he wants to take advantage of the *e* mute for some specific purpose

as that just mentioned, must manage to get it before a consonant. Now this is not always easy. If the poet had been free I have an idea that he would have made it read *Rom' qui . . .*, just as in the first line of the preceding speech of Camille he would have put:

"Donn' moi donc, barbare, un cœur comme le tien"

putting in some other syllable to replace the ugly *Donnei*—moi . . . just as Kahn did in the line quoted on p. 12:

"La justice en pesa la têt(e) dans sa balance"

This shows the legitimacy of one, among many, of the 'licenses' adopted by the Symbolists. There is no reason whatsoever why a poet should be hampered by rules like that of the *e* mute. Béranger's *Bouquetière* (quoted on p. 13) would be a silly song had he observed the rule of the *e* mute. The verse of Musset (quoted on p. 6) is ridiculous when said according to the rule:

"Coupe-l(e) en quatre et mets les morceaux dans la nappe"

Musset, who often violated the hiatus rule on purpose, most certainly meant: *Coup'le en quatre . . .* Mr. Kastner provides an excellent example for our standpoint, namely, he quotes the great actor Got as pronouncing an alexandrine of Molière with three superfluous *e* mutes, and making quietly out of it an enneasyllabic line:

"Aux chos(es) queu peut faire un(e) femm(e) volage"  
(p. 10).

Freedom is not necessarily disorder. The poets will need no special rule to prevent them from trespassing certain limits. In cases, for instance, when a conflict would arise with ordinary pronunciation, the poet will take no freedom with the *e* mute. On page 9 the author tells us that the feminine *e* invariably counts when it separates two identical consonants (as: *violente tempête*), and in case of liaison (as: *tu sembles une femme . . .*). These are rules of pronunciation and it is superfluous to offer them as specific rules of poetry.

One sees that the use of the synthetic method has distinct advantages. Mr. Kastner's long and

dreary—though in its way accurate—treatment of the *e* mute might have assumed cohesion, system, clearness, all qualities which do not in the least exclude facts, but only classify them according to importance. Every single case quoted by him would have found a place in a thorough synthetic treatment as well as in his plan.

The second part of Chapter II takes up the problem of the diphthong. Here again the desire to give facts under the form of rules instead of trying to get at the meaning of these facts, has led the author astray. He follows Tobler on a false path.

“When (excepting *e* mute) vowels happen to be contiguous in the body of the word, the question is to ascertain whether they belong to different syllables, or to the same syllable and consequently form a diphthong. The only way of arriving at a logical result in this matter is to set aside the empiric methods of treatises on French Versification, and to apply etymological principles, as was first done by Tobler.”

So far philology and poetry had been kept away from each other, and it may be that it was not a happy thought to bring them together. The principles for the distinction of diphthongs from other contiguous vowels are formulated easily enough (pp. 20–21, p. 25); but no less than eighteen pages of exceptions have to be added: Which shows either that the philological principle is inadequate, or that the poets did not care much about it. The latter seems to be the correct interpretation. Any unprejudiced person should reach this conclusion, it seems, when he confronts such hopeless cases as those offered here. When one and the same poet, and no less a poet than Victor Hugo, choses one day to scan *chouette*, and another day *chouette*, one day *mo-elle*, and another *moëlle*, *a-ôût* and *août*, *dou-aire* and *douairière*, etc., it is evident that the only logical deduction is that there is no rule, or at least that no rule was followed. See again on page 46 where Corneille rimes *odi-eux* with *mieux*, Racine *soutien* and *Indi-en*, Hugo *évanou-it* and *nuît*, Leconte de Lisle *harmoni-eux* and *cieux*; this is a pure dilemma: you accept the facts, without com-

ment, or you refuse to call any longer poets such men as Corneille, Racine, Hugo and Leconte de Lisle.

There is no sense in formulating nowadays rules for poets—especially for poets of the past—in the name of a science they did not know. It reminds one involuntarily of a famous scene in the *Médecin malgré lui*, between Lisette and M. Tomes about the dead coachman.

The empirical method remains the correct one. Only it is not necessary, while using it, to aim all the time at rules. Why should not freedom be the rule? Let us not reproach poets because in this point at least they did not wait for Banville and the Symbolists to teach them that the true poet is the one who makes his own rules, or at least is not the slave of archaic or useless regulations.

The chapter on Rime is much clearer—and for the reason, no doubt, that there is a directing idea in Mr. Kastner's mind, namely: “the one essential condition of good rime is that it should exist for the ear” (p. 41). He can appeal here to the authority not only of the Symbolists but of the great Rostand himself:

Un baiser mais à tout prendre *qu'est-ce*  
Un serment fait d'un peu plus près, une promesse  
Plus précise . . . .

and this seems to give him more courage.

An excellent field for historical treatment was offered by the ‘Enjambement.’ The poets of the Middle Ages were above all things careless, and never thought of allowing themselves to be bound by such exacting rules as that forbidding overflow. Later, however, came the schoolmaster Malherbe, sung by the second schoolmaster Boileau:

Et le vers sur le vers n'osa plus enjamber.

They took care, however, to state with minuteness, the cases in which the divine rule might be infringed without damage either to language or poetry. In the nineteenth century some of the good lyrics (Musset, Banville, Verlaine, etc.) used the enjambement frequently with the only purpose of making fun of the classical precept, while occasionally from Racine to Victor Hugo some great poet used it to produce very strong effect.

The *hiatus* had a similar history: first, no rule: then Ronsard recommends using it sparingly, and Malherbe forbids it, preferring to work three years over a little poem rather than to violate a childish rule and give way to inspiration. All the true poets know exactly when it is right and when it is unnecessary to avoid the principle. Plenty of examples bearing out this statement can be gathered in Mr. Kastner's work.

The foregoing remarks are sufficient to show what one may miss in the book under discussion. Mr. Kastner has been reproached for not having given room enough to the recent French poetical school. He has given Symbolism more attention than most contemporary writers. But what he might have done, if he had allowed himself to be inspired more by the historical spirit, would have been to show that in fact the recent movement was only the logical outcome of the whole evolution of French Versification up to the present day.

We may be very brief with regard to the second part of the book. Chapter VIII, on the "History of the Various French Metrical Lines," is not so rich in data as others. We would like some statistics in proof of the assertions of the author. Chapter IX gives a long enumeration of 'strophes' with the different arrangement of rimes in each one of them. Nothing is said, however, as to their comparative value. Moreover, one does not know whether according to the idea of the author, there is something binding in all those modes of arrangement; in other words, are the 'strophes' to be considered à *forme fixe*, or not? Sometimes one might disagree with the author in his classification. For instance, on page 190 he discusses the strophe of nine lines running thus *aab ccb ddb*, and gives as a variant of it the following one by V. Hugo in *abb bac cca*:

Voici le signal !—  
L'enfer nous réclame;  
Puisse un jour toute âme  
N'avoir d'autre flamme  
Que son noir fanal !  
Puisse notre ronde,  
Dans l'ombre profonde,  
Enfermer le monde  
D'un cercle infernal !

Would not the arrangement: *a bbb a ccc a* be more satisfactory than the one proposed, and is not this form of the nine line strophe altogether independent of the form quoted above. How can one see a division after the third line, and again after the sixth line?

On pages 184-185 a strophe is misplaced by the printer.

Chapter X is very consistently written. It deals with "Certain fixed forms of French poetry." We miss, however, an example of the classical and graceful form of the rondel of Charles d'Orleans: "*Le temps a laissé son manteau . . . or Dieu qu'il fait bon la regarder . . .*" An imitation by Banville is given on p. 257, showing that Mr. Kastner appreciated the combination.

In the chapter on *Rimeless Poetry* (the last) no word is said of the Symbolists who have been quoted frequently in proper places elsewhere.

In the Bibliography, we note the omission of such books as Remy de Gourmont's *Esthétique de la langue française*, A. Beaunier's *Poésie Nouvelle*, Kahn's *Symbolistes et Décadents*, Vigier Lecoq's *Poésie contemporaine* (which is, however, quoted on page 41), and F. J. A. Davidson, *Ursprung und Geschichte der Ballade*.

ALBERT SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Gottfried Keller, sa Vie et ses Oeuvres* par FERNAND BALDENSPERGER. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1899. Pp. iii + 507.

During the last years of his life, Gottfried Keller, without any doubt, had come to be universally considered the most prominent then living writer of fiction in the German speaking world. His pictures of quaint and quiet life in obsolete little Swiss towns during the middle of the nineteenth century, his portraits and caricatures of strange characters, chiefly chosen among the lower class of tradespeople, the sturdiness, the archaic charm and the very provinciality of his vision of life, all this appealed strongly, for a certain while, to a constantly increasing number of readers.

A reaction however has set in. And if Keller was somewhat overrated, he is now beginning to be unduly neglected. This passing wave of popularity has nevertheless, as a fortunate result, brought forward several excellent critical essays on the Zurich novelist. Among them, Bächtold's edition of his letters and diaries stands first and still now contains almost all the literary material needed for the study of Keller's life and writings.

The present volume is a thesis offered in partial fulfillment of the requirements of a doctor's degree at the Sorbonne. It is intended for a public that probably first heard of Keller, when at the time of his death the newspapers mentioned his name. Baldensperger, therefore, not only gives a history of Keller's life and of the origins and sources of his writings, but he gives also a complete and sympathetic argument of all his novels; yet as he says himself (p. III): "une analyse est un commencement de commentaire." Thus in the first part of the volume he prepares the reader for the systematic analysis of Keller's literary character, which occupies the six chapters of the "deuxième partie." These chapters are devoted to an exhaustive discussion of Keller's "helvétisme," his "romantisme," his "sens de la vue," his "humeur," and his "style et langue;" to them is added a final chapter "conclusions" in which the results of this analysis are summed up. This part of the volume is obviously the most important one; it contains practically everything that could be said about Keller's literary personality and it is mostly well said. It seems, however, somewhat exaggerated if Baldensperger says (p. 466) "La phrase de Keller est considérée par les meilleurs juges comme un modèle de prose allemande," and "Ses phrases, souvent fort longues et composées de propositions nombreuses et dépendantes, ne donnent presque jamais l'impression d'enchevêtrement que produit si souvent la prose allemande." No doubt Keller's vocabulary was practically unlimited and he always knew how to find the most expressive term. But he was drawing his words from all possible sources and his taste was sometimes more than catholic. The words he uses, his metaphors and the scenes he describes are sometimes deplorably coarse, and passages like the one on page 91 of vol. I of the *Leute von Seldwyla*<sup>1</sup> are unfortu-

<sup>1</sup> 5te Auflage. Berlin, 1887.

nately no isolated exceptions. And the beauty of his narrative is often seriously marred by sentences of the following kind: "Beide aber trafen zusammen in der Überzeugung, dass der andere, den anderen so frech und plump übervorteilend, ihn notwendig für einen verächtlichen Dummkopf halten müsse, da man dergleichen etwa einem armen haltlosen Teufel, nicht aber einem aufrechten, klugen und wehrhaften Manne gegenüber sich erlauben könne, und jeder sah sich in seiner wunderlichen Ehre gekränkt und gab sich rückhaltlos der Leidenschaft des Streites und dem daraus erfolgendem Verfall hin, und ihr Leben glich fortan der träumerischen Qual zweier Verdammten, welche auf einem schmalen Brette einen dunklen Strom hinabtreibend sich befanden, in die Luft hauen und sich selber anpacken und vernichten, in der Meinung, sie hätten ihr Unglück gefasst;" or: "Denn das Fleckchen Erde mit dem Steinhäufen darüber, auf welchem bereits wieder ein Wald von Nesseln und Disteln blühte, war nur noch der erste Keim oder der Grundstein einer verworrenen Geschichte und Lebensweise, in welcher die zwei Fünfzigjährigen noch neue Gewohnheiten und Sitten, Grundsätze und Hoffnungen annahmen, als sie bisher geübt." <sup>2</sup> To call such passages models of German prose is to do injustice to authors like Heine, Nietzsche, Hartleben or others, with whom the writing of artistic German has never been a lost art.

Otherwise, Baldensperger's analysis is entirely plausible, and the whole book is a most creditable specimen of the kind of criticism of German literature which is now being practised at the best French universities.

ALBERT HAAS.

Bryn Mawr College.

#### SCANDINAVIAN POPULAR SONGS.

*Les Vieux Chants Populaires Scandinaves* (Gamle Nordiske Folkeviser) par LÉON PINEAU. ii. Époque Barbare. Paris: 1901. 8vo., 584 pp.

The author has made a diligent study of the folklore, not only of the Scandinavians, but of

<sup>2</sup> *Die Leute von Seldwyla*. Berlin, 1887, vol. I, pp. 80 and 81.



other peoples as well. In a preceding volume he has presented an interesting study of the Songs of Magic; in the volume now before us he takes up the songs of the barbarian epoch, grouping his material under three great divisions: The divine legend, the heroic legend, and diverse songs.

In the songs belonging to the first division, traces of the old Scandinavian mythology are still encountered. The gods still figure prominently in many of these songs, though sometimes in the disguise of Christian saints. No god, however, is so popular as Thôr. He is the hero of one of the very finest as well as most ancient of folksongs, the famous "Thôr af Havsgaard," the theme of which is familiar from the *Þrymskviða*. The author argues for the independent development of folksong and Eddic poem from a common source, and, we may say, that this is characteristic of his point of view throughout the book. To prove his case, he relies on internal evidence, which of necessity gives free scope to subjective opinion, and is, therefore, rarely convincing, unless supported by data resting on a more certain basis.

In the chapter devoted to a discussion of the Edda the difficult question of the origin of the Aesir and Vanir is touched on. The author attributes to the latter a pre-Germanic, possibly Celtic origin, and tries to prove that Thôr was originally of the Vanir race. This is not the view held by the best Germanic scholars of the present day. The well-attested worship of Nerthus, a Vanir-deity, by Ingvaeonic tribes, the identification of Freyr, another Vanir-deity, with the legendary progenitor Ingvo, as well as his mention in the Anglo-Saxon genealogical tables, all contribute to make the theory of the non-Germanic origin of the Vanir untenable. Thôr is anterior to them; in Norway, at least, his worship is indigenous. When Odinism was introduced later on, it came into conflict both with the cult of Thôr as well as that of the Vanir.

There is plainly noticeable throughout the book a tendency to discover fundamental resemblance in the case of songs of apparently different content. This tendency is justifiable enough if confined within reasonable limits; but, in our opinion, the author goes too far, when he asserts the fundamental identity of Young Svejdal and Svend

Vonved. The adventures related of the two heroes are not at all similar. We confess that we fail to detect a striking resemblance between the theme of the Svend Vonved song and the Lesbian story, which is used as a third term of comparison. We also fail to see a reason why we should suppose that the winning of a maiden by a predestined lover constituted the main motif of the song in its original form, unless it be the desire to find a parallel to the song of Svejdal.

Nor do we see any reason for assigning a mythical basis to the mediæval "Klosterrofvisor." The events related in these poems—the liberation of a maiden imprisoned in a convent—happened frequently enough in mediæval times. This the author himself admits. Then why believe that such songs could not have arisen independently of any mythical basis?

In the second part of the book the author takes up the heroic legend and approaches the difficult subject from the standpoint of the folksong. The first legend to claim our attention is that of Siegfried. M. Pineau unhesitatingly assumes that the folksongs are independent of, and in many respects more primitive than, the tradition of the Eddas or Thidreksaga. As he bases his discussion of the legend on this assumption, one should think that the truth of it should be established beyond all possibility of doubt, all the more because it conflicts with the view held by some of the best Germanic scholars, notably Wolfgang Golther. In our opinion, the author utterly fails to refute Golther's arguments. In fact, no attempt is made to refute them beyond a declaration that the strophes in the Faroese poem telling of Asla's birth are spurious and a later addition. Strophes bearing an undeniable Christian stamp (*e. g.*, Regin smiður, 25, 26) are likewise rejected as not genuine. The presence of the strophes telling of Sigurð's change of form with Gunnar (Brinhild, 223, 224)—on which Golther bases one of his principal arguments—is completely ignored; the author even tells us that the folksongs had no knowledge whatever of this interchange of form (p. 243). On the other hand, instances are adduced where, in the author's opinion, the songs have preserved more primitive traits than are

found in Eddic tradition. But, unfortunately, the primitiveness of these traits is a matter of subjective opinion and of doubtful value as evidence.

M. Pineau's views on the origin of the legend are decidedly original and opposed to those commonly held by scholars. According to him, only the second part, the legend of the destruction of the Nibelungs, is of German origin. The first part, however, the Siegfried saga proper, developed in the Scandinavian North independently of German tradition. To account for the explicit references in the Edda poems and the Volsungasaga to German localities, the Rhine and Frankland, the author advances the theory that, the second part having been carried to the North by German singers and being unmistakably German in its local coloring, the Eddic poets, in order to harmonize the first part with the second, "Germanized" the whole. The theory is improbable in itself and nothing but the most convincing proofs could ever make us accept it. But no such proofs are given. The fact that in the Faroese songs the real myth, the original part, contains no references to German locality, proves nothing, for neither does the second part, which is admittedly of German origin, contain such references. Nor is anything settled by the fact that the legend was known among the Scandinavians anterior to the tenth century, for, if it assumed shape during, or shortly after, the period of migrations, it could very well have come North by that time. That the story of Balder and Hother in Saxo is a reappearance in euhemeristic form of the Sigurd-myth is a mere assertion. The stories are not even very similar. The argument based on the presence of the Sigemund-episode in the Beowulf epic is not conclusive, because it takes for granted that the legends contained in that poem had been fully developed among the Scandinavians and been made by them the subject of song, which is not at all certain, nor even probable. As for the identification of the name Wälse with that of the Slavic divinity Volos, it is a mere conjecture. And so the assertion that the Scandinavians had not received the Siegfried saga from the Germans, or vice versa, remains an assertion unsupported by convincing evidence and at variance with the generally accepted view.

In his discussion of the interpretation of the legend, the author shows himself a pronounced adherent of the mythological school. The identifications of the dragon with the "vafflogi," of Brynhild with the treasure, of the "Glasberg" in the Danish song with the Gnitahæth are accepted as incontestable. Elaborate parallels are presented between Siegfried on the one hand, and Apollo, Jason, Perseus, Achilles, Rustam and Krishna on the other. These parallels are certainly ingenious, but to us they are not really convincing. For, though there are undoubted resemblances, there are at least as many, if not more, undoubted differences. By emphasizing the former and ignoring the latter, it is no doubt possible to establish parallels more or less satisfactory. But the mythical formula that may be deduced therefrom is so perfectly general and so absolutely colorless as to be devoid of all character, and, consequently, of all human interest. Even in Indo-Germanic times people possessed fully developed legends and stories, and what legend could be more commonplace than that of a hero overcoming some mighty monster? Such a story, however, probably bore no greater resemblance to that of Siegfried, or any other of the above-mentioned heroes, than to that of David and Goliath.

The author closes his discussion of the Siegfried saga by tracing the fortunes of the hero and his offspring and descendants in later folkpoetry. He finds, moreover, echoes of the legend in many songs that at first glance seem to have little similarity to it. Such are, for instance, the songs about Jon Rand and Peder Riboldsøn. Possibly this may be so. But when the author also detects such echoes in the songs of Svend Feld and Hjelmer Kamp, we think he is going too far. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that every dwarf, troll, giant, rival, or plain villain, that stands in the way of a lady's happiness and freedom and perishes at the hands of a valiant knight must be a variant of Fafnir. We believe that in arriving at such a conclusion, imagination has had a larger share than sober judgment.

The second subdivision in the discussion of the heroic legend is devoted to the famous Dietrich of Bern. It is conceded at the outset that this leg-

end, while of East-Gothic origin, is of essentially German development. But Scandinavian tradition represents the hero very differently from German tradition and knows, moreover, of many events concerning which German tradition is silent. Hence the author rejects the opinion most generally held, according to which the folksongs, as well as the Thidreksaga, are based on older Low German songs, and propounds a theory similar to that which he advanced for the Siegfried legend. According to him, the material of the Diderik songs is essentially and primitively Scandinavian and existed long before the Thidreksaga was composed. But German poetry being the fashion in the North, the Scandinavian poets "Germanized" their native material. The author lays great stress on the passage in the preface to the Thidreksaga where we are told that Danes and Swedes had many such old sagas as those that make up the Thidreksaga, and also many songs "*er fyri löngu voru ort eptir þessari sögu*" (p. 362, note). "Ce passage établit nettement l'existence d'une tradition nordique parallèlement à la tradition allemande." Undoubtedly; but this does not argue against the German origin of these songs. The Thidreksaga was written in the thirteenth century, and the Dietrich legend arose as early as the sixth century. That the latter was well known in the North by the ninth century and had already received poetic treatment is attested by the runic inscription on the Rökstone. Such songs were known to the writer of the Preface to the Thidreksaga, and no wonder he should think they were composed a long time ago. The material probably came North in the sixth century, or shortly after, and then took place the parallel development of which the author speaks. M. Pineau thinks that the heroes of the Diderik songs are purely Scandinavian and owe their German names to German influence; as proof of this, he suggests that the real hero and chief figure of the song "Diderik ok hans Kæmper" is not Diderik but Viderik, son of Verland. But he does not seem to be aware of the fact that this Viderik Verlandson is the German Witege or Wittich, the Anglo-Saxon Wadga, son of Wēlent the smith, and, therefore, originally no more of a Scandinavian hero than Diderik. The whole legend, as it appears in the

Scandinavian songs, is claimed by the author to be of pre-Germanic origin and of mythical character. For Bertingsland is Bretagne, and Bretagne, we are told, is the realm of the dead. Lastly, the supernatural birth and disappearance of the hero are cited as arguments for his mythical origin. But these supposedly mythical traits admit of a perfectly simple explanation. They were introduced under ecclesiastical influence and are expressive of the hatred which the orthodox Christians entertained for the heretical Theodoric. They are, therefore, neither mythical nor primitive. (See Jiriczek, *Deutsche Heldensage*, Strassb., 1898, p. 269.)

For the songs which treat of Diderik's heroes, such as "Den skallede Munk," "Ulf van Jaern," the author likewise claims a Scandinavian origin. Also for "Memering and Ravnliil," a story of slandered innocence vindicated. But again we ask, why should German names appear in a song of Danish origin and content? In one variant Henrik is duke of Brunswick; in another, his bride is Gunder of Spire, *i. e.*, Speyer. The theme of the song, M. Pineau tells us, is common to all Germanic peoples and has spread widely over Germanic territory. It appears even in the North under another form in the Eddic lay entitled *Goprunarkviða* iii. But, we must remark, this song is of late origin and exhibits German influence. The ordeal of the boiling kettle did not come North until the eleventh century; in the poem it is Saxi, king of the Southmen, who knows how to consecrate the kettle. It seems to us that, wherever we look, traces of the German origin of the material constituting the Diderik-cycle are clearly discernible. Decidedly we cannot agree with the author when he declares (p. 382) that German influence on this cycle "est, en somme, aussi minime que possible." On the contrary, we believe, that but for this influence the songs of the Scandinavian Diderik-cycle would never have taken shape.

The third part of the book is devoted to a consideration of diverse songs. Among the many interesting themes to be met with here is also that of Walther and Hildegund. The author rejects, and we fully agree with him, the fanciful mytho-



logical and historic interpretations of the legend attempted by Scherer, Müllenhoff and Müller. Nor does he accept, and again we think he is right, Andler's theory of the Irish origin. The theme was common to all Germanic tribes. That it was well-known in Scandinavia is attested by the fine Swedish song of King Vallemo, to take but one example.

Finally, we have a discussion of the famous legend that inspired the song of Hagbard and Signe. The author does not believe Saxo's statement that the story is historically true; he thinks that the historian used oral tradition, songs existing at his time. Such a song is the one which we have before us. M. Pineau opposes the opinion of those who believe that the chronicle inspired the song. He points out that all the variants of the song, while similar in development, exhibit in their details considerable divergence from the chronicle. To him the version of the song seems much more simple and logical than that of Saxo. But if the original draft of the story was what he makes it out to be on the evidence of ancient Germanic law, then it certainly was far inferior in poetic quality, not only to the song as we now know it, but also to Saxo's account. We should remark, moreover, that it is not the nature of folkpoetry to be painstakingly accurate and consistent in detail. Nor does it concern itself scrupulously with strict logic. Arguments based on considerations of this kind are not convincing.

When it comes to interpreting the legend, we find ourselves utterly unable to accept the author's views. To him the main feature of the legend is the fact that the hero disguises himself to get near his beloved. Now all the legends, Greek, Germanic, Celtic, where such a disguise is the main motif, are identified and the motif is then submitted to a careful scrutiny with a view of arriving at its correct interpretation. The feminine disguise of a hero is found to have been primitively a metamorphosis, such as that of Zeus into a serpent, bull, swan or eagle. All disguises are mythic in origin. According to the mythologists, it would never occur to a man to put on a disguise in order to accomplish a desired object. Every feature of the disguise, moreover, admits of interpretation. Mr. Wolfskehl is sure that the long

hair of the disguised warrior symbolizes the storm-cloud pregnant with lightning. M. Pineau is positive it is symbolical of the rays of the sun. Hagbard is a solar hero. But more than that. He is identical with Sigurð, for a Faroese song and a Swedish song attribute to one single personage the adventures of both Hagbard and Sigurð. This is true enough if we believe that every story of a woman who can be won with difficulty, but is finally won by a predestined hero, is a variant of the Siegfried-Brynhild legend. But we do not believe that. Nor do we believe that every story telling of the surprise of a lover during a love-scene is necessarily a recast of the Hagbard-story. We do not see the slightest reason for giving a mythological significance to the legend of Hagbard and Signe. To us the story is perfectly human. All the efforts to interpret it mythologically involve arbitrary assumptions and lead to grotesque absurdities.

In conclusion, the author points out the reasons why the Scandinavians, though possessing abundant material, never succeeded in bringing all this scattered matter into one artistic whole, in a word, in creating an epic. The reasons for this are to be found chiefly in the Scandinavian character itself, but the climate and nature of the country are also important factors.

A word about the translations. It is at best a difficult task to translate poems from a Germanic into a Romance language. On the whole, M. Pineau has performed his task very acceptably. But his translations from the Edda contain several serious errors. Thus in his version of the *Skírnismol* (Str. 31) "*pik morn morne*" is translated (p. 158) "*du matin au matin*," whereas it probably means "may sorrow consume thee." In strophe B. 33 the words *en firenilla mæx, en fenget hefr gambanreipe gopa* are certainly not correctly rendered by "*Fuis, misérable fille, avant que ne t'ait frappée la colère des dieux!*" The meaning is: "Thou wicked maid, who (lit. since) hast drawn upon thyself the severe wrath of the gods!" The words *erge ok oepe* (Str. 35) do not mean "impuissance, désespoir" but "lust and rage." In strophe 8 [B. 43] of *Fáfnismál* (ed. Jonsson, p. 42) the lines *Yggr stakk porne,*



*apra felde horgefn hale, an hafa vilde* are completely mistranslated by "Yggr l'a piquée de l'épine : elle aimait mieux tuer les hommes, la vierge blonde, que les épouser" (p. 243). The translation ought to be : "Yggr stuck her with a thorn ; the maid felled other men than he would have."

Summing up, we must say that we are not in sympathy with the main tendencies of the book before us. We do not concur in the view that always regards tradition of the folksongs as a more primitive source than that of the written monuments. We find ourselves unable to accept the new theories propounded, and we differ decidedly as to the interpretation of the heroic legends. There is too much in the book that bears a purely hypothetical character. Nevertheless, we believe that, on the whole, the book is of decided merit. The completeness of its material as well as the charming manner in which the material is presented call for well nigh unstinted praise. Scandinavian scholars have every reason to welcome the author to a field into which French scholars have hitherto rarely ventured. We hope this is but the beginning. It can only be of advantage to Germanic studies if there is brought to them more of the elegance and taste for which the writers of France have ever been distinguished.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Columbia University.

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

JOSEPH BÉDIER: *Études critiques*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1903, xi-295 pp.

In this book, M. Bédier, the editor of Thomas' *Tristan* and the successor of G. Paris in the late master's chair at the Collège de France, has collected five articles, all dealing with special questions of modern French literature and all having one point in common: "posant un problème d'histoire littéraire, [ils recourent] pour le résoudre, non aux opérations divinatoires du goût, mais aux ressources techniques de la philologie." M. Bédier thinks that the methods which care-

fully handled by skilful workers have brought about such wonderful results in the study of Classical and Mediæval literatures may be applied with the same accuracy and the same advantages to the study of modern French texts and authors. He would not have us believe that philology and antiquity are closely connected in some unaccountable manner; he cannot admit that what is legitimate, useful and necessary when you deal with the Middle Ages becomes at once a form of disguised and useless pedantry as you pass on to the sixteenth century; he points out that the field of modern research offers to us many problems similar to those raised by the study of the older literature. Why should they be left unsolved? If you try to solve them, why should you not use the same methods?

We have no reliable texts of some of the greatest French writers. In more than one instance, in the absence of an authoritative version left by the author, editors have established their text in a kind of haphazard way, often with no concern but to suit their own taste, trying at best to strike a happy mean between obvious extremes. Is it not surprising to learn that, in spite of three modern editions, we do not yet have a thoroughly reliable text of d'Aubigné's *Tragiques*? There was in the way of the editors a curious difficulty that had to be removed: none of the three has even attempted it. The result is that we have not the text in the form that d'Aubigné meant should be definitive, but in the form that seemed definitive to Lalanne, Read, and Réaume and Caussade: of course it would have been surprising if they had agreed on the determination of that particular form, and they have not. It may be that the critical edition for which M. Bédier wishes would not work very startling changes in the text of the *Tragiques*: it would work some, and that is enough. Think that it is not only a fiery satire on sixteenth century men and conditions: it is a beautiful epic, the only epic of any extent that we have in Modern French. Why should not this splendid poem receive at the hands of editors at least the same amount of care, respect and devotion that the humblest relic of Classical or Mediæval literature is sure to have? In his first paper ('Le texte des *Tragiques* d'Agrippa d'Aubigné') M.

Bédier has made the task easy for any who will feel tempted to give a critical edition of d'Aubigné's masterpiece.

Again is it unimportant to the student of Pascal to know when he is quoting from the *Entretien de Pascal avec M. de Saci*, whether he is quoting Pascal himself, or Desmolets, or Havet, or Tronchai, or Adam? And yet who might have been quite sure before M. Bédier gave a critical edition of it first in the *Revue d'Histoire Littéraire*<sup>1</sup> and then in the volume we are reviewing? ('Établissement d'un texte critique de l'*Entretien de Pascal avec M. de Saci*'). Indeed, until quite recently, nobody had ever suspected that there was any difficulty about the text of the *Entretien*.

The third paper ('*Le Paradoxe sur le Comédien est-il de Diderot?*') shows us an unexpected and brilliant application of that subtle and unerring method of which M. Bédier is a master. It enables him to say what looks like the last word in a controversy that less than two years ago made no little commotion in the literary and scholarly world. Doubts were suddenly cast on the authenticity of the *Paradoxe sur le Comédien*, a little work that for seventy years, ever since it was printed in 1830, had been held as one of Diderot's undisputed masterpieces. M. Dupuis, it appeared, had found a manuscript of it, written in the hand of Naigeon, a friend of Diderot, and this manuscript had one peculiarity: it was so full of crossed words and sentences, of additions written between the lines and in the margins that it must be the author's and not a scribe's manuscript. Therefore Naigeon was the author of the book, not Diderot. Such was M. Dupuis' conclusion,<sup>2</sup> in which many good judges of literature concurred. The *Paradoxe* ceased at once to be a masterpiece; blemishes by the dozen were found in it, people wondered how they had been deceived so long, some even wrote to the papers to state that they had been all along suspecting the truth; poor Naigeon was held up to the execration of posterity for a worthless plagiarist and scoundrel who had tried to force his rather poor stuff on an unsuspecting public. A few people, however, failed to

be convinced by M. Dupuis' arguments, among others Diderot's editor, M. Tournoux, who maintained his faith in the genuineness of the St. Petersburg manuscript which he had used in his edition, and M. Faguet who persisted in seeing in the *Paradoxe* a book which no Naigeon could have written. But M. Dupuis remained unmoved: his arguments might be distasteful to certain people, but they had not been disposed of; his manuscript had to be accounted for and none of his opponents had offered the slightest bit of reasonable explanation for it: they appealed to rather doubtful canons of literary taste, he relied on facts. What would have been the end of that curious literary quarrel? Most probably M. Dupuis would have gained his point: indeed the majority of judges believed he already had. The consequences might be far-reaching: if the *Paradoxe* was the work of Naigeon, who then had written the *Correspondance avec Mlle. Voland*, part of the *Lettre à Falconet*, the *Voyages*, the *Promenade du sceptique*, the *Rêve de d'Alembert*, all of which works had been handed, along with the *Paradoxe*, to the editors of 1820 by the same Jeudy-Dugour? Was it Diderot? Surely there might be room for reasonable doubts. And so Diderot stood in a fair way of being deprived of some of his most characteristic works. That was the moment when M. Bédier came to his rescue. He discarded every extrinsic argument; his first care was to examine minutely the fac-simile of a few pages of the manuscript given by M. Dupuis in his edition of the *Paradoxe*. And soon he came to an interesting discovery, which was afterwards confirmed by the study he made of the manuscript itself, now preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Here we must refer the reader to M. Bédier's most ingenious and very convincing argumentation: the details of it do not lend themselves easily to being given in a résumé. It is enough to mention his conclusion. If Naigeon is the author of the *Paradoxe*, there are some strange peculiarities about his way of writing his own works that have to be accounted for; as we study him in the Dupuis manuscript, he reveals himself as a writer who never thinks of a correction until after he has completed a line, who is often dissatisfied with the first expression he gives to his thoughts, but never with the second, and whose

<sup>1</sup> T. IX, p. 351. [1902].

<sup>2</sup> See a fuller account in *Rev. d'Hist. Litt. de la France*, t. IX, p. 519. [1902].

talent as a writer is decidedly at its best when he writes in the margin. All that is startling enough if you insist on seeing in him an author, who is sometimes at a loss for the right word and labors to find it, who hesitates, corrects himself, tries several possible expressions before he chooses the best. Everything is clear, if you admit that he is nothing but a scribe who had once made a fair copy of the *Paradoxe* and some time after, having got access to a revised and enlarged manuscript of the same, decided not to make a second copy but to preserve the first, only amending it: he therefore set himself carefully to strike out in it every word that had been sacrificed by the author, while, on the other hand, all the new matter found its way to the space between the lines and to the margins. A conclusion is forced upon us: Naigeon is not the author of the *Paradoxe*. That is all M. Bédier cares to assert; he is content with having, as he says, brought the question back to what it was before M. Dupuis' discovery. Of course, there was no question then about the authenticity of any of Diderot's posthumous works, and on those, if any, who care to cast suspicion on them will now fall the burden of proof.

In his fourth paper (Un 'fragment inconnu d'André Chénier') M. Bédier makes it quite clear that a fragment of twenty-six lines which had been so far attributed to a Polish poet, Niemcewicz, a friend of Chénier, must be set down to the credit of Chénier himself. The amusing thing about it is that these few lines have found their way into all important editions of Chénier, ever since Gabriel de Chénier published them in 1874, without anybody questioning the first editor's assertion about Niemcewicz being the author of them.

The last paper is the longest (169 pages against 125 for the four others) and the most interesting of the book ('Chateaubriand en Amérique. Vérité et fiction.')<sup>3</sup> On the tenth of July, 1791, a young Frenchman of twenty-three landed at Baltimore with the intention of discovering the northwest passage to the Pacific Ocean. For an

undertaking of such magnitude, Chateaubriand (that was the young man's name) was little prepared, being alone, without definite notions about the difficulties of the task, with no information on the country and only a moderate amount of money. Little wonder if having gone as far as the Niagara through Philadelphia, New York and Albany, he thought it wise to turn back: he was soon in Pittsburg, but then in some strange way he started for a long journey down the Ohio and the Mississippi. How far did he go? On this point he has never been very explicit. But scattered passages in his books allow us to form an idea of the extent of that prodigious trip. Open the *Voyage en Amérique*: Chateaubriand has been down the Mississippi as far as the sea. True, the *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe* mention only the Natchez as the extreme point south reached by him in his journey down the Mississippi. But both agree in making Chateaubriand travel through what is to-day Alabama, Georgia and Florida as far down as the thirty-second degree. And then from Florida he worked his way through the Natchez again, Jackson, Florence, Nashville, Knoxville, Salem, Chillicothe (a curiously round-about way) up to Philadelphia, where he was to sail for France, as we know, on the tenth of December, 1791. Truly he had seen many things in five months. Had he seen them all? M. Bédier answers no. He examines closely into the details of that wonderful journey; he goes with Chateaubriand to every place, every spot visited by him, follows minutely every indication of his guide, stops at the same houses, dines with him in Philadelphia with Washington, travels to New York in the same stage coach, journeys down the Ohio and the Mississippi in the same canoe, strikes at his heels into the wilderness of 'the Floridas,' visits in his company Cuscowilla, the Seminole village and Apalachuela, the town of peace, explores at his side an 'island of the Ohio,' all the while taking no rest, starting at daybreak, stopping at night-fall, suffering no obstacles such as forests, streams, etc., to stand in the way, going to the extent of riding fifty miles a day on horseback for thirty-seven days on end, in a word flying in a kind of wild, hurried, fantastic run through the length of the American continent:

<sup>3</sup> It is a new edition—reworked and revised—of a series of three papers first published in *Rev. d'Hist. Litt.*, t. VI, p. 501, [1899]; t. VII, p. 59, [1900]; t. VIII, p. 80 [1901].



all that to no purpose; for when Chateaubriand reaches Philadelphia, together with M. Bédier, he finds that his boat (the very boat that actually took him to Saint Malo) has left port thirteen days before! Make him travel a little more slowly,—more in accordance with the standards of the time: he will be weeks and months behind time. Conclusion: Chateaubriand's statements as to the extent and the details of his journey are not to be taken too literally: in fact it is doubtful whether he ever went south of Baltimore. It is true that he has pictured for us fine Southern landscapes and that he tells us at great length about the customs and manners of the Indians in Florida, in fact gives us of his supposed journey to that land just such minute and seemingly accurate description as a keen, observing, careful traveler and eye-witness would.<sup>4</sup> But M. Bédier will tell you the reason of this. Chateaubriand had read a good many books of travel and he knew how to turn his reading into account; he had perused the works of Le Page du Pratz, J. E. Bonnet, Jonathan Carver, and especially those of Father Xavier de Charlevoix and William Bartram, and he pressed them all into service. M. Bédier has brought to light those yet unsuspected sources, and he puts beyond a doubt the fact of Chateaubriand's close imitation of them. Now why did Chateaubriand choose to give his readers such a magnified and impossible account of a

journey, part of which at least was really made? When he wrote it, in the *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe*, M. Bédier points out, he was bound by the former assertions of his uncautious youth. In the *Essai sur les Révolutions*, in the *Génie du Christianisme*, in his contributions to the *Mercur*, many times, in and out of place, he had alluded to his marvelous adventures in the New World, to the boundless tracts of land over which he had traveled: for years he kept on indulging in these fine dreams and found it harder and harder, we may suppose, to believe they had been only dreams. He may have been caught himself by his own poetic eloquence and the ring of sincerity that was in it. M. Bédier calls it a fine case of autosuggestion. But no wonder if that led him into difficulties later on when he set himself to write a chronological account of his life. It would be idle to talk of plagiarism: Chateaubriand turned the colorless accounts of worthy travelers into a prose of wonderful magnificence. They provided the materials, he handled them as only a great artist could. Yet the fact remains that few great artists have used such a peculiar method of work. André Chénier's case is certainly quite different. At any rate, whatever view one may take of the matter, M. Bédier's investigation has given us a new and deeper insight into Chateaubriand, the man and the writer.

In this new book, M. Bédier works hand in hand with that group of distinguished critics and scholars who have founded the Société d'Histoire Littéraire de la France, and who have tried for the last ten years—with increasing success and authority—to bring literary criticism in France under the control of the scientific spirit,—to the exclusion of intellectual laziness and dilettantism. He is setting forth their program as well as his own—and it is a good one—when he says:

“La philologie n'est pas le tout, ni la fin, ni le principal de la critique; elle n'en est pas non plus l'accessoire; elle en est—simplement—la condition. En effet, elle suppose moins l'apprentissage de certaines recettes et de certains procédés de recherche, qu'une discipline générale de travail, une habitude intellectuelle, un *esprit*: et c'est essentiellement la volonté d'observer avant d'imaginer, d'observer avant de raisonner, d'ob-

<sup>4</sup>It is interesting to note that Lowell had suspected something of the truth. See what he writes in *My Study Windows*: “Most people seem to think, the more trees the more birds. Even Chateaubriand, who first tried the primitive-forest-cure, and whose description of the wilderness in its imaginative effects is unmatched, fancies the ‘people of the air singing their hymns to him.’ So far as my own observation goes, the farther one penetrates the sombre solitudes of the woods, the more seldom does he hear the voice of any singing-bird. In spite of Chateaubriand's minuteness of detail, in spite of that marvelous reverberation of the decrepit tree falling of its own weight, which he was the first to notice, I cannot help doubting whether he made his way very deep into the wilderness. At any rate, in a letter to Fontanes, written in 1804, he speaks of *mes chevaux paissant à quelque distance*. To be sure, Chateaubriand was apt to mount the high horse, and this may have been but an afterthought of the *grand seigneur*, but certainly one would not make much headway on horse-back toward the druid fastnesses of the primæval pine.” (*My Garden Acquaintance*.)

server avant de construire; c'est le parti pris de vérifier tout le vérifiable, de chercher toujours plus de vérité, en se rappelant, comme le dit l'un de nos maîtres, 'qu'il n'y a pas de moindres vérités, de vérités indifférentes, ou de vérités négligeables.' "

The words sound familiar enough; but it is always a pleasure to hear them from a man who has so vividly realized their meaning and knows so well how to carry out their spirit.

LUCIEN FOULET.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*François Villon* par GASTON PARIS. Hachette, 1901, pp. 191. (*Grds. Écriv. Franç.*)

The original part of this work does not consist so much in new facts on the life of the poet, for M. Paris acknowledges that all his information is gained from the latest discoveries, nor in new interpretations on the works of Villon, these will be found from time to time in the *Romania* under the head of *Villoniana*, *notes critiques sur le texte de Villon*, but in the new setting or atmosphere in which he brings the poet before us. Heretofore Villon had been considered simply from the standpoint of historical facts, such as are gathered from his works and a few stray references by way of criticism by other writers (cf. Longnon, etc.). In order to rightly judge, appreciate, and value Villon we must know the time in which he lived, the circumstances under which he was reared, the condition or standard of morality and honor in the fifteenth century, the state of professional life (magistrates, clergy, law), the attitude of nobility and royalty toward the subjects; only then can we perceive Villon's character and fully appreciate his significance in fifteenth century poetry, his importance in the history of French literature, and judge him and his work from an unprejudiced standpoint and gain a much higher and broader view than has heretofore been possible. This M. Gaston Paris has done and done in a way few men would be capable of doing; for he, above all others, had that keen appreciation of and deep

literary insight into the beauty and value of Middle Age literature and society, which enabled him to see Villon as few scholars have been able to see him.

The importance of this work in the history of French literature is more than a passing one, for Villon occupies that peculiarly difficult position to characterize, the transition period between the Middle Ages and modern literature. His significance can only be appreciated by a knowledge, such as M. Paris possessed, of both periods. There is possibly another reason for the importance of this work; M. Paris had gained for himself the reputation of a most careful, accurate and conscientious scholar; his judgments were seldom questioned, never in his own special field; we, therefore, can conscientiously and unhesitatingly accept his judgment of Villon. We find that M. Paris has gone to no extreme; Villon is not painted too dark and gloomy, not too much of a debauchee and bohemian; he is a pure type of the time, nothing out of the ordinary, nothing monstrous. The objection heretofore to Villon constantly set forth has been from the religious point of view. By drawing a true picture of the state of religious life in the fifteenth century M. Paris has overthrown this whole theory or point of view. M. Gustave Lanson says (*Rev. Univ.*): "No one before M. Paris has defined the intellectual state of Villon, his culture, what he took from the previous French poetry, what men and works influenced him; he has put the poet in his social milieu and his work in the literary milieu." We might add that a student, looking for a type, that might fit into the theory of Taine, could find no better example than Villon, and M. Paris has demonstrated again, consciously or unconsciously, that the powerful influence of Taine is still at work.

The following is a short résumé of some of M. Paris' conclusions. The reviewer would state in the beginning that the work must be read and studied to get any adequate idea of its importance.

The book is divided into three chapters: the life, the work, the success. Space would hardly allow of any detailed account of the life of the poet, which was a series of frolics, bouts and possibly crimes, repentances and vows of reform, escapes from justice, banishment and pardons.

M. Paris concludes on this life so agitated, so criminal and miserable that we must not judge it too severely nor with too much indulgence. Villon was without doubt a good-for-nothing drunkard, gambler, debauchee, spunger or hanger-on, seducer, sharper and robber; his excuse that hunger drove him to this life is not valid, for he abandoned all honest means. His only desire was to drink, be happy, and have a mistress; he would not work. It must be remembered that nearly all the soldiers robbed, pillaged and lived a life much like that of Villon. The misery in Paris drove people to gain a living by almost any means. And even if these criminals were caught they were usually pardoned. The sentiment of personal dignity was almost extinct. The great lords betrayed, perjured and plundered the poor; the church procured money through indulgences; the University sold degrees. Villon did not feel that he was really bad and his contemporaries did not judge him so. The church power was supreme; all crimes against the commandments were about equally punished. The distinction now made in offenses did not then exist and the feeling of honor was not what it is to-day; thus, Villon did not feel at any time of his life that he was morally corrupt: he felt regret and humiliation, but these were soon lost by appealing to the Virgin Mary. He repented sincerely until the occasion came to sin again; but these periods of repentance preserved his poetic nature and made it possible to preserve the pure sentiments which he expressed with the same candor as his desires for the material life or his remorse. His pure sentiments we find in his poems and they are: piety, humility, tenderness for his mother, gratitude toward his adopted father, (*plus que père*), sympathy for human miseries, and patriotism.

He did lack energy and delicacy; he was lazy, weak and changeable; he was what is called to-day "an impulsive." We have a perfect picture of his life in his poetry in which we see him pass from one sentiment to another, from a given tone to an opposite tone, from a prayer to a grimace, from a grave and sober reflection to an obscene joke. He was always at the mercy of the impression of the moment, of the companion who dominated him, of the woman who fascinated him, of the occasion that tempted him.

From his very faults, moral and material sufferings there sprang from his poetry what is newest, most personal and lifelike, brilliant and attractive. Had he gained honors he would have composed weak, commonplace poems as his contemporaries and would never have become the first of modern poets. The faults of Villon have lost an honest man in the past, but gained a great poet for all time to come. We must be indulgent because, as Th. Gautier said, good poets are still rarer than honest men.

In the second chapter M. Paris defines the state of French poetry before and during Villon's time and concludes that the poetry before Villon of Machaut, Deschamps, Froissart, Christine de Pisan, Martin Le Franc, could hardly have influenced him much as he undoubtedly read very little of it, since it was not accessible to the "petites gens," being written on sumptuous manuscripts for kings and princes and preserved in libraries. With one exception—*Le Roman de la Rose*—all the literature of the fifteenth century was buried in manuscripts.

An estimate of Villon's poetry is next given. The disadvantage of it is that we are not familiar enough with the time and the personages characterized. To appreciate it fully we must have lived in Paris at the time, known the places, things and the men he speaks of, although many allusions are explained now by scholars; yet, only a student of Villon literature can appreciate Villon's poetry. We have the poet in all his weakness and trouble of his soul, in the disquietude and poverty of his life, in the *naïveté* of his desires, in the bitterness of his regrets, in the inconsequences of his old age. At times cynical, but always sincere; the struggles between his weakness and will, conscience and passion, reason and instinct, just as we find them in all human hearts; but Villon has exposed them with more frankness, *netteté* than ever before, so that his poems touch and impassion us. This personal poetry attracts us by its documentary value and from the point of view of sympathy.

Villon's position in the history of pure lyrical poetry is next examined. No French poet before him had undertaken to choose himself as the central figure and make all else turn about him. Outside of Du Bellay and Regnier he remained



the main representative of this personal poetry until the beginning of the nineteenth century, when it is again found in Chénier. Musset is the only poet who comes near Villon's spirit until Verlaine. Thus Villon is the first of modern poets and at times belongs to the great poets. His claim to this lies: 1. in the marvelous facility with which he passes from one tone or mood to another; 2. in his keen sense of observation and painting exterior reality; 3. in his peculiar sense of *gaieté*, often causing an involuntary laugh, partly due to the subject and treatment, partly due to his vocabulary.

Villon often falls into low trivialities, into commonplace remarks or jokes and abuse of *jeu de mots*. In spite of all this and his often obscure and uneven language, loose syntax, liberties in rhyme, etc., M. Paris feels that the poetry of Villon does not need to be always understood, that there is a charm in it by itself, as in the prose of Rabelais, and the reviewer would add like that of Verlaine. The words have a sort of magical effect, more through their sonority and arrangement than through their signification. The subjects have long ago lost their charm, partly due to their nature, partly due to the obscure references, which are often very unpleasant. The language is so old and so obscure that it often becomes unintelligible. To get the full benefit and charm of Villon's poetry it must be thoroughly studied, and the more it is studied the more its charm is felt.

His poetry, then, is especially attractive through the simplicity of expression, the truth of inspiration and sincerity of sentiments; through this it rises above all the poetry of his contemporaries. Added to this is the realistic sentiment, plastic power and phantasy, filled with sane, wholesome, correct and sound ideas. He is a true poet of the large city; he wrote to amuse himself and his fellow comrades. For a long time his poetry remained accessible only to the *lettrés*. The poetry of the fifteenth century was doomed to lack all epic inspiration, moral grandeur and true sentiment of nature; nothing great was in the spirit of the time. The merit belongs to this "mauvais garçon," who drew from the Quartier Latin and the streets a poetry which raised the

banal and mannered poetry of the court to a poetry of real inspiration and poetic grandeur; for this posterity owes him much.

As to the success of his works in his own day we only know that owing to the many spicy allusions to men, places and events they were circulated widely and known by almost everyone. Up to the end of the fifteenth century no mention of his name is made; possibly because such personal poetry, so little artificial was not considered real poetry by the poetasters of the time; but, they were immensely popular with the people. The first meritorious mention we have is by Eloi d'Amerval about 1500 in his *Grande Diablerie*. Marot, who had published a new edition of Villon, confesses that he gained a great deal from the reading of Villon. Fauchet, in the sixteenth century, is the only one who appreciates him. The seventeenth century seemed to revive Villon and up to the nineteenth century the appreciation of the poet increases constantly. Th. Gautier is the first to appreciate him fully, in 1832. There are fine judgments by Nisard, Gerusez, Demogeot. Campaux, in 1859, devotes a thesis to: *Villon, sa vie et ses œuvres*, spoken of in high terms by M. Paris. Later on there are many fine characterizations by such men as Montaiglon, Lanson, Brunetière, Petit de Julleville, Saintsbury and Suchier.

The influence of Villon in the fifteenth century is quite pronounced. Guillaume Alexis borrowed from him the refrain *Bienheureux qui rien n'y a*. One group of poets imitated his *Testament*; another his manner of treating love. His bohemian life also inspired works as the *Farce Pathelin*. His descriptive power, pleasing, joking and satirical, is imitated by Henri Baude, Coquillart and Roger de Collerye. The Villon spirit is in the air of the time. Marot owes a great deal to him. In the sixteenth century nothing definite can be said: but in the seventeenth Patru, Boileau, La Fontaine knew and admired him. Voltaire imitated him in his youth; Th. Gautier, Banville and Baudelaire each one took from Villon whatever corresponded to their nature. Verlaine is a modern Villon. Richepin calls him his master and model.

The most remarkable and astonishing part of

Villon's success is his being adopted by the Pre-raphaëlités; there was a Villon society founded. John Payne translated his entire work, to which Swinburne and Rossetti added some ballads in the Villon style.

This book on Villon has been under way for sixteen years. A previous book taking an opposite view and based on arguments of facts, seemingly irrefutable, delayed the publication of this work, which is based on a moral point of view entirely and which has been justified by later discoveries.

HUGO P. THIEME.

University of Michigan.

#### SPANISH DRAMA.

*Lope de Vega and the Spanish Drama*, being the Taylorian Lecture (1902), by JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY. Glasgow: Gowans & Gray; London: R. Brimley Johnson, 1902.

To those who have followed the current of Spanish literary criticism it must have been evident for some years that Lope de Vega, the "Monarch of the Spanish Stage," has been slowly but surely regaining his kingdom. To this turn in the tide of popular favor the Spanish Academy has contributed in a large degree by the publication of the monumental edition of the works of Lope de Vega, edited by the foremost of Spanish critics, Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo. The Academy surely does itself honor in thus honoring one of Spain's greatest sons. Indeed, Lope is the greatest of all Spaniards with the sole exception of Cervantes. And yet this great poet, this *Fénix de España*, as he was called by his countrymen in his lifetime, has suffered the fate of having his glorious name overshadowed by the later and lesser lights who happened, for a time, to gain the plaudits of the fickle, changing crowd. Calderon, who appealed to a different side of the Spanish nature, almost completely supplanted Lope in popular favor. Calderon became the name to conjure with. How true this is, and how completely Lope was overthrown, is shown by an examination of the collection of *Comedias Escogidas*, published in forty-four volumes between 1652 and 1704. Into this col-

lection those plays that had met with the most marked success on the stage, naturally found their way. And though Lope had been dead only seventeen years when this series began, Calderon is here the ruling name. The third volume is the only one that contains any number of Lope's plays. Indeed—hardest fate of all—Lope's comedias were frequently published under the names of lesser poets who happened to be popular at the time. How complete was the change that had been effected by a quarter of a century! Then everything that was excellent was designated by Lope's name. The plays of minor poets, to get them into print and to get the public to buy them, were heralded as written by the great Lope. So did scores of weak and inflated comedias masquerade as the work of the great wizard, who looked on for a long time with indifference and without uttering a protest. But after his death the rôles are reversed. Lope's name had lost its power to charm, and the offspring of his brain seek shelter under the names of strangers. We find, glancing through the volumes of *Escogidas* that Lope's *El Monstruo de la Fortuna* is ascribed to *tres ingenios*; *El Marques de las Navas* to Mesqua; *La Batalla de Honor* to Zárate; *La Condesa de Belflor* and *El Premio en la misma Pena* to Moreto; *El Amor enamorado* to Zabaleta; *Sin secreto no ay Amor* to Montalvan, and many more might be mentioned. The crowd turned their backs on the great creator of the Spanish Drama and eagerly sought the plays of Matos, of Zárate, of Zabaleta, and Godinez,—indeed, even of such obscure poets as Jacinto Cordero, Muxet de Solis, Padre Calleja, Martinez de Meneses, Guedeja and Llanos.

But in late years the tendency is clear amongst Spaniards and foreigners who have studied Lope closely, to place him once more upon the pedestal where he rightly belongs, as the greatest of all Spanish Dramatists. The excellent biography of Lope by La Barrera was published by the Spanish Academy in 1890. It contains a vast amount of material important for the student of Spanish literature of the period embraced by Lope's life (1562-1635), but it naturally—La Barrera was human—contains also some inaccuracies which later researches have rectified. But La Barrera's biography is an immense tome which few, after all, except special students, would care to read. It

was therefore a very happy choice which the distinguished Spanish scholar, Mr. James Fitzmaurice-Kelly made for his Taylorian Lecture at Oxford (1902), to give a brief and comprehensive survey of Lope de Vega's life and work, embracing the results of the latest investigations. This truly admirable essay—*Lope de Vega and the Spanish Drama*—which tells in the brief space of sixty-three pages all that any but a special student would care to know of the career of Spain's greatest dramatist, is written with all the vigor and charm of style for which this scholar is so well known. Indeed, I cannot do better than give one or two excerpts from the Oxford Lecture by which the reader may judge for himself the quality of Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's performance. Speaking of Lope de Vega at the height of his career, our author says :

"He was one of the sights of Madrid. As he returned from the hospital, where he attended the sick and dying, men turned to look at him in the street ; women and children clustered around him to kiss his hand, and to crave his blessing. His daily walk was as a royal procession : his portrait hung on the walls of palaces and cabins. So contemporaries tell us, and so we love to picture him in his august old age—the living symbol of all the might, and pride, and glory of heroic Spain." (p. 25).

Here is another passage a few pages farther on :

"Though his [Lope's] household was on a modest footing, he was always pressed for money. He gave without stint in charity, and he died poor. He had many afflictions to crush him ; yet he lived every day of his life, did the work of twenty men and we cannot doubt that—on the whole—his long, tumultuous existence was a happy one. We see him in the ardour of aggressive youth, and watch him still battling, in the zenith of his renown. But we like best to think of him under another aspect during the last decade of his career : composing masterpieces as easily as he breathed, and conscious that after countless combats, the victory is his. We perceive him rejoicing in the calm autumnal splendour of his fame, but never more content than when playing with his children in the garden," etc.

Finally, I cannot help quoting this concluding passage :

"The one remedy for those who do not appreciate Lope is to read him. To attack the huge library of dramatic literature which he has bequeathed us is an enterprise calling for courageous perseverance during years. The result will repay the effort. If, on the one hand, the man who reads with care all Lope's surviving plays is inevitably condemned to read little else, on the other hand, such a reader has before him the certainty of being interested, moved, and delighted for no small part of his life-time. He will learn to know a genius, unequal indeed, but never dull ; he may be exhausted by Lope's indefatigable cleverness, but he will never weary of his author's company. He will see pass before him the entrancing pageant of a vanished age, a society vivid, picturesque, noble, blazoning its belief in God, the King, the Point of Honour, as imperious realities governing the conduct of an entire nation ; he will meet with personages of all grades, presented in every circumstance from the most tragic to the most laughable, and he will make acquaintance with a score of heroines as fair and gracious as Rosalind or Beatrice. I invite you to make the trial. And I confidently anticipate that here, as in other countries, the verdict of all who have thus qualified themselves to pronounce judgment will be unanimous. It will surely declare that literary history reveals no more interesting personality than Lope de Vega : that this great poet was also the mighty inventor of an original form, that he was a consummate expert in dramatic creation, with no equal in his own country, and—save Shakespeare only—no superior elsewhere."

Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's Taylorian Lecture is the best account of the life and work of Lope de Vega with which the writer is acquainted, and he cordially commends it to all who take an interest in the Golden Age of Spanish letters.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.



## FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Lettres inédites de Mme de Staël à Henri Meister*, publiées par MM. PAUL USTERI, Ancien professeur à l'École cantonale de Zurich, et EUGÈNE RITTER, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Genève. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie., 1903. Pp. viii, 284.

It is well known that, after the death of Mme de Staël, her family fearing lest her reputation might suffer took every precaution to prevent the publication of her letters. Thus it is supposed that the Duchesse de Broglie succeeded in gaining possession of the box containing her mother's letters to Benjamin Constant—epistles which would be of the most piquant interest, but which have without doubt been destroyed.

The excellent *Notice* of Mme de Staël by her cousin, Mme Necker de Saussure, was, for the same reason, edited with the greatest care and criticized by the most intimate friends of the family. Mme Rilliet-Huber, the life-long friend of Mme de Staël, says in a letter to Henri Meister: "Si vous aviez été ici, vous auriez fait partie du conseil épuratoire. Il importait trop à la mémoire de celle qui a tenu une si grande place pendant sa vie, que cette notice dise presque tout, et pas tout."

The archives of Coppet are, even to this day, jealously guarded against too curious investigators.

However, as Sainte-Beuve long ago remarked, it is only by repeated victories that one triumphs over posterity, and the best thing that can happen to keep the memory of an author green is to have "deux ou trois de ces retours et de ces réveils magnifiques qui étonnent les générations nouvelles, qui les convainquent qu'un mort puissant est là, redoutable encore jusque dans son ombre et son silence."

Already in 1862 Saint-Beuve remarked that the renown of Mme de Staël had suffered on account of the unwillingness of the family to allow the publication of any letters. In that year, however, the family did make an exception in favor of the letters written to the Grand Duchess Louise, because they corrected some generally accepted misstatements in regard to their author.

Since then Mme de Staël has had, in spite of the precautions of her family, more than one such awakening, and, although a few things have been printed which a generous editor would have omitted, we have now a truer and withal a more favorable picture than formerly of this remarkable woman who during her life was exposed to the severest criticism, partly on account of her prominent position and partly through her own imprudence and impulsiveness.

Thus in 1887 were published the *Journal intime* and a collection of letters by Benjamin Constant, and the next year appeared *Lettres de Benjamin Constant à sa famille*, with an introduction by Mme Menos, both of which publications awakened as much interest in Mme de Staël as in her less renowned friend. Then followed the great work on Mme de Staël by Lady Blennerhassett, and Albert Sorel's excellent volume in the *Grands Écrivains*.

Since that time the reviews have frequently contained articles on Mme de Staël. A year ago was published M. Paul Gautier's volume on Mme de Staël and Napoleon, of which I hope soon to speak more in detail, and, last autumn, the *Lettres inédites de Mme de Staël à Henri Meister*. Mention might also be made of the two volumes by Mlle Lucie Achard: *Rosalie de Constant, sa famille et ses amis*, in which there are many interesting references to Mme de Staël. Some of the letters to Meister were published by Lady Blennerhassett, but they were not always correctly dated. In fact, one great difficulty in editing letters by Mme de Staël is that the dates usually have to be supplied. "Je n'ai jamais vu," said Sainte-Beuve, "une aversion du chiffre et du millésime aussi complète que dans les lettres de cette femme supérieure."

We must bear in mind that Mme de Staël usually wrote her letters hurriedly. She says herself: "Depuis que j'ai visé tout ouvertement à la célébrité, je n'ai plus donné aucun soin à mes lettres." Accordingly, as Mme Necker de Saussure remarked, "elle n'y mettait que l'esprit qu'elle ne pouvait s'empêcher d'avoir." That, however, was quite sufficient to make these letters very interesting.

Mme de Staël was too passionate, too impatient

to sit down and compose letters à la Mme de Sévigné or Voltaire, and would not write letters unless she had a special reason for so doing.

A circumstance which renders this series of letters especially interesting, is the fact that they extend over a period of thirty years and thus enable us to follow their author throughout her eventful career. M. Ritter (for the editing is chiefly his work) has accordingly divided the letters into six chapters, corresponding to the historical periods. The first letters date from the time of Louis XVI, and the last from the Restoration.

To an uninitiated, the task of editing letters would seem comparatively easy. In reality, it is often an extremely difficult thing to do well; nor is the labor spent upon it always apparent except to those who are acquainted with the correspondence in question.

M. Ritter has had a very difficult task to perform, but the copious notes, the brief explanations here and there, the extracts from other letters and from books bearing on the question in hand, show with what excellent judgment and scholarship the work has been performed. It is, like all the books of this savant, who has just celebrated his thirtieth anniversary as professor in the University of Geneva, an exact, painstaking and scholarly piece of work.

The portion of the book that will be read with most interest by those who have not paid especial attention to the career of Mme de Staël, is the excellent *Notice* of Henri Meister, the recipient of these letters.

Meister was one of those German Swiss, like Bât de Muralt and Bonstetten, who successfully adopted the French language. His father was an enlightened and broad-minded Protestant pastor; Henri also prepared for the ministry and took orders before he had completed his nineteenth year.

On a journey to Geneva, which he took soon afterwards, he won the friendship of Paul Moulton, the liberal Protestant minister, the intimate friend of Rousseau and one of the correspondents of Voltaire. Through Moulton he was enabled to visit Rousseau, whom he accompanied on a long tramp in the mountains. He also presented himself at Ferney, where he was kindly received by

Voltaire, who said to him among other things: "Soyez toujours tolérant: c'est une des premières vertus des ministres de l'Évangile."

Of greater importance than these two celebrities for the future of Henri Meister, were two ladies whose acquaintance he made in Geneva, Mme de Vermenoux and Mlle Suzanne Curchod. Less than a year afterwards he received a letter from Moulton, offering him the position of tutor of the eight-year-old son of Mme de Vermenoux, which position had hitherto been filled by Mlle Curchod, who had just married M. Necker, the wealthy banker and the future minister of Louis XVI.

After some hesitation Meister accepted the offer, and from then on he was an interested spectator and commentator of the great events of those stirring times.

After a stay in Paris of eighteen months, Meister and his young pupil spent two years in Switzerland. The occasion for their leaving Paris was the love which was springing up between Meister and Mme de Vermenoux; this love-story began with a rose-leaf plucked from the lady's lips and ended, years after the death of Mme de Vermenoux, in the placing of a tin-box containing her heart in the coffin of Henri Meister.<sup>1</sup>

In 1768 Meister had secretly printed a little essay *De l'origine des principes religieux* in which he tried to prove that religious ideas have a human and natural origin. Diderot was much pleased with the work and Voltaire prophesied the author a bright future. In Zürich, on the other hand, the book, being adjudged an attack on religion, was publicly burnt and its author was banished from Zürich forever. Meister at once returned to Paris where he was warmly welcomed by Mme de Vermenoux.

A couple of years later he succeeded Grimm as editor of the *Correspondance littéraire*, the famous manuscript journal by which the courts of Europe were kept informed of the chief political, literary and social events of Paris. For about forty years Meister continued this work which brought him a comfortable livelihood, but no literary reputation. Meister had a fluent pen and published many books and pamphlets, all of which are long since forgotten. The most important was *De la morale*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 9 of these letters and d'Haussonville, *le Salon de Madame Necker*, Paris, 1882, p. 214.

*naturelle*, which had a great success and which Wieland translated into German.

In 1812 Meister was surprised by the publication of five volumes of the *Correspondance* (from 1770-1782) without his consent or knowledge. The work was attributed only to Diderot and Grimm. Meister then determined to continue the publication himself and in 1813 five volumes containing the *Correspondance* for the years 1782-1790 appeared. Meister was too little concerned about his literary reputation to allow his name to appear on the title-page, and it was not until the edition of the *Correspondance* by Maurice Jau-neau, 1877-1882, that Meister's large share in the work became known.

Meister had arrived in Paris just after the birth of Mme de Staël, who was named Germaine for her god-mother, Mme de Vermeux. Mme Necker's friendship for Meister was inherited by her daughter, who had known Meister all her life and after the death of Mme de Staël her children continued in their letters to show their love and respect for the venerable old man.

The most interesting of the letters published in this volume are those written during the reign of terror, when Mme de Staël, having taken refuge in Switzerland, made heroic efforts to enable both friend and foe to escape from Paris. These letters breathe enthusiastic devotion and undaunted courage and reveal to us the great kindness of heart so characteristic of this great woman.

It will be noticed that these letters, written to one much older than herself, although they are always sincere and frank (Mme de Staël could not be otherwise), nevertheless have a more subdued tone than is common with Corinne. Again, the fact that Meister was an admirer of Napoleon caused the letters written during the Empire to show a slight feeling of restraint. Sometimes one is tempted to find fault with Mme de Staël for too often writing merely in order to ask a favor of her old, complaisant friend, without in return taking him fully into her confidence.

On the other hand, in the extremely interesting letters to A. W. v. Schlegel, written in 1813 and printed as an appendix to the letters to Meister, the tone is quite different. Addressing an intimate friend of about her own age, the tutor of

her children, she writes as though she were speaking to him. In these few letters to Schlegel we get a better idea than from the long series to Meister of the real Mme de Staël, that passionate and impulsive woman, ambitious to succeed in literature, in politics and in society, whose whole heart belonged to her friends, but who exacted a like devotion in return, and who, insatiable in her many desires, always eager and indefatigable, too soon exhausted her strength and died worn out by her own energy.

WILLIAM KOREN.

Princeton University.

#### SPANISH LITERATURE.

*Cuentos Castellanos*, selected and edited, with notes and vocabulary, by MARY D. CARTER and CATHARINE MALLOY. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1902. Pp. vi, 200.

Teachers of Spanish among us will welcome a good collection of short stories suitable for early reading. One or more are promised us, but none has yet appeared quite up to the desired standard. The present one is exceptionally weak in making good any claims for intrinsic worth. It is composed of eight selections, headed by Valera's *Pájaro Verde*. Most of the remaining seven are of doubtful merit for their purpose, and are chiefly notable for their lack of interest, point, or moral. All but two occur in the Paris volume of *Cuentos Escogidos* ("de los mejores autores castellanos contemporáneos"), published by Garnier: a mediocre source of supply containing some good matter but much more that is thoroughly decadent in theme and tone. The American volume has a critical editorial comment on each of the authors represented, comments containing little of biographical facts and scarcely anything else of interest to the reader. It is a singular coincidence—even if it be an accidental one—that these comments read like free translations, in whole or in part, of the corresponding introductions in the Paris volume.

The editorial workmanship is in keeping with the poor literary taste displayed in the quality of



the selections, and is scant in redeeming features. A close inspection reveals a long and tedious chapter of defects, only a few of which, because of lack of space, can be registered here. The vocabulary in particular abounds in omissions and mistakes, upward of a hundred of these having been noted; not to speak of many more with definitions incomplete or inadequate to the sense of the text. Although the book is assumed to be complete for the needs of the reader, it omits any explanation of a number of difficult terms, while the explanation given to others is misleading or quite erroneous. Here are a few samples of the former:—

Page 17, l. 11, *turrón de Jijona* (neither word occurs in vocab.), a highly esteemed Spanish confection; p. 17, l. 19, *¡Quién la viera ahora!*, 'would, or how I wish, that I might see her now!' (perhaps an elliptical expression from *¡Quién sería más feliz que yo si la viera ahora!*); p. 23, l. 7, *se las prometen felices*, i. e., 'have pleasurable anticipations' (with slight prospects of realization); p. 48, l. 5, *¡Que (sic) había de saltar! ¡Que (sic) se había de meter!*, 'the idea of (her) jumping, of (her) putting herself! (i. e., here, getting on the railroad track); p. 54, l. 15, *por una merienda*, 'for a song'; p. 65, l. 17, *¡Cómo ha de ser!*, 'how can it be helped!'; p. 87, l. 7, *y no haces nada de más*, i. e., 'that's quite proper.'

The following are a few of the misleading or erroneous editorial contributions: P. 3, l. 24, *resucitó* from *resucitar*, "to resuscitate, to renew:" here the verb is neuter, 'to come back to life.' P. 6, l. 28, *crencha*, "parting of the hair:" for 'tresses,' 'locks.' P. 31, l. 20, *estar fresco*, "to be disappointed, to be lost:" for, 'to be in a "pretty pickle," in a scrape.' P. 46, l. 6, *despuntaba*, "to commence, to begin:" for, 'to blunt;' i. e., (here) 'to cut off' (the corner of). P. 46, l. 8, *jícara*, "little cup:" for, (here) 'insulator' (= *aislador*). P. 57, l. 24, *inútil* is here, specifically, 'unfit for the (military) service.' P. 61, l. 6, *constipado*, "constipation:" for, 'cold' (which *constipado* always means, and of which *resfriado* is a common synonym). P. 66, l. 1, *sudando como un pollo* = *hecho un (pollo de) agua*, which seems to have suggested to the editors their only clue, for their vocab. under *pollo*

(= fowl), as "pool, drain." The expression means *estar lleno de sudar*, and may have originated from the hyperbolic idea of thorough aqueous immersion as presented by the soaked plumage of a fowl; cf. 'dripping like a wet hen.' P. 66, l. 12, *de un tirón*, "at once:" for, 'with a jerk.' P. 68, l. 9, *se deshicieron (en elogios)*, "they melted, became uneasy:" for, 'they were lavish' (in praise). P. 85, l. 11, *americana*, "a kind of coat:" for, specifically, a 'sack coat.' P. 87, l. 8, *adefesio*, "extravagance, folly:" for, 'looking like a fright.' P. 87, l. 21, *partida*, "departure:" for, specifically (here), 'lot, quantity.' P. 89, l. 5, *velones trípico*s, (the last a typ. error for *típicos*?), "night-lamp:" it is not necessarily a special kind of bed-room lamp but the typical old-fashioned fixture, of ghostly illuminating power, found in Spain and some parts of Italy, and of lineal descent from the standard old Roman article. P. 99, l. 19, *basquiña*, "upper petticoat (?) worn by Spanish women:" possibly the editors refer to a (kind of) 'skirt,' a form of short-skirted gown or jacket characteristic of the female garb of certain parts of Spain, particularly in the North. P. 112, l. 9, *viejo verde*, "strong old man:" for, 'gray-haired dandy.' P. 112, l. 23, *por todo lo extremo*, "in every part of the arena:" for, 'to the utmost.'

Apart from mere inaccuracies or omissions, the vocabulary has some remarkable examples of splay definitions, as, e. g., *descabellar*, "to disorder or undress the head;" *quinto*, "the one on whom the lot falls to serve in army:" for 'conscript' or 'recruit' (*recluta*); *sebe*, "place enclosed with a high paling," for 'inclosure' or 'lot'; *constipado*, "stoppage of cuticular pores occasioned by cold," etc.

The text, such as it is, would have gained by the absence of a number of passages and expressions, which, in an elementary class, can hardly avoid causing embarrassment to both teacher and learner. The writer disclaims any special squeamishness in such matter. But obviously many things may be freely allowed in a book for ordinary purposes which cannot for a moment be tolerated in a language text liable to intensive reading in mixed classes: in other words, one in which every sentence and word are subject to

careful analysis. In the writer's judgment, the present volume has too many places of this nature standing for an expression of thought that may be proper enough in good literature but which are only stumbling blocks for elementary classes. He might point out a number of these examples. But the topic is an ungrateful one. *Peor es meneallo.*

R. E. BASSETT.

University of Kansas.

### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Unter vier Augen*, Lustspiel von LUDWIG FULDA.  
*Der Prozess*, Lustspiel von RODERICH BENEDIX.  
Edited with Notes and Vocabulary by WILLIAM ADDISON HERVEY, Instructor in Columbia University. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1902.

Just why these two pieces should be edited together does not seem clear, for there is no connection between them. Doubtless the editor's purpose was merely to adapt for early reading some unhackneyed and interesting material. The two short plays, which are of about the same difficulty, are written in a very different style. The first is reprinted from Thomas and Hervey's *German Reader and Theme-Book*,—the notes being revised and expanded. The reviewer has a warm feeling of gratitude to Roderich Benedix, for he found no other literature so helpful in acquiring the language of everyday life at the beginning of his student days in Germany as he did the *Haus-theater* and other pieces of Benedix.

The selections are undoubtedly good ones, and the editor has done his work carefully and thoroughly. The introduction and vocabulary are ample, and the notes are suggestive and stimulating. There are, however, a few points to which exception might possibly be taken.

p. 1, l. 3, *nur*: no satisfactory rendering for *nur* in this sense either in the notes or in the vocabulary.

p. 13, l. 9, *schon*: this use of *schon* is explained neither in notes nor in vocabulary.

p. 36, l. 17, *so eine*: this colloquialism might well be commented on.

p. 37, l. 27, *das*: 'that sort of people.'

p. 38, l. 9, *auch*: *auch* thus used is nowhere explained.

p. 38, l. 16, *Haben Sie gesehen heute beim Termin*: colloquial word order; cf. note to p. 44, l. 11.

p. 41, l. 15, *Sie hätten ja können bestohlen werden*: a cross reference to a note on a following passage,—p. 44, l. 11,—should at least be given.

p. 47, l. 25, *wird einem ganz flau*: it might prove helpful to call attention to this frequent idiom.

p. 49, l. 26, *eins auswischen*: for explanation of this use of *eins* cf. Thomas's Grammar, ¶ 318, l. a.

note to p. 2, l. 8, What is said about *Herr* and *Frau* applies also to *Fräulein*.

note to p. 55, l. 9, *was man so geschimpft nennt*: is not 'ordinarily' nearer this use of *so* than 'really.'

### Vocabulary.

*anlegen*: 'set up' or 'build' would be a good word to use of the mill.

*Delikatessenhändler*: better 'dealer in delicacies.'

*Geschmack*: the reviewer is skeptical about the statement that the plural *Geschmäcke* is rare. He has often heard the expression "Die Geschmäcke sind verschieden." Cf. other examples in the *Wörterbücher* of Grimm, Sanders, and Heyne.

*herumhetzen*: omitted; cf. p. 44, l. 15.

*nachtragen*: omitted.

*Schliesser*: omitted.

*übermütig*: is not the sense of this word, p. 9, l. 24, *überaus lustig*, 'exceedingly gay' rather than 'high-spirited?'

*unbedingt*: add meaning 'by all means.'

*vorig*: 'the same' is regular equivalent of *Vorige* in stage directions.

*wagen*: *frisch gewagt*, 'nothing venture, nothing have.'

In a book intended for young students such questionable English should be avoided as "There wouldn't be much to him" (note to p. 37, l. 17); "I guess we've got you" (note to p. 39, l. 27); and "be through" (vocabulary under *Ende*). In the note to p. 8, l. 29, the words 'as called in

theatrical parlance,' do not sound right; in the note to p. 49, l. 24, 'related or not' is possibly ambiguous; and the note to p. 56, l. 19 is not clear.

It may be doubted whether such long grammatical notes as those to p. 20, l. 20, p. 47, l. 17, and p. 49, l. 24, are for the best. If grammatical references are given, it would be well to give them not only to Thomas's Grammar, but also to the other school grammars which are widely used.

Misprints are p. vi, l. 8, 'rneasoing' for 'reasoning'; p. 21, l. 25, *verzu-ckerte* for *verzuckerte*; in note to p. 12, l. 2, 'not' seems to have been omitted; note to p. 16, l. 26, 'chaperone' for 'chaperon'; note to p. 21, l. 19, 'subject' for 'subjunctive'; note to p. 30, l. 19, 'orick' for 'brick'; 'vocabulary also' for 'usual also'; under *Ballmutter*, 'chaperone' for 'chaperon'; under *einerlei*, 'mat-matter' for 'mat-ter'; *einig* and *einige* had better be given as two different words in an elementary work; *früher* should be indented differently; under *Schwager* plural should be *Schwäger*; under *Titel*, (*i*) for (*ï*); under *vertreiben* past participle *vertreiben* for *vertrieben*.

To follow his plan consistently the editor ought to have omitted (*haben*) after *fortfahren* and inserted (*sein*) after *herziehen*. He should have printed *loskommen* for *los'kommen*, *gestreng* for *gestreng'*, *gesund* for *gesund'*, and it would have been well to indicate the accent thus on *ausgezeich'net*, *beob'achten*, *bisher'*, *jedoch'*, *Minu'te*, *nachdem'*, *sobald'*, *sofort'*, *sogar'*, *sogleich'*, *vorerst'*, and *wahrschein'lich*.

This appears to be a rather long list of exceptions, but the errors are for the most part petty ones,—such as will almost invariably creep into the first edition of any book. Some of the things mentioned are merely in the nature of suggestions, about which there may well be a difference of opinion. The criticisms are made solely with a view to increasing the usefulness of the little book. Let the last word be one of warm praise for it and genuine appreciation of its excellence.

CHILES CLIFTON FERRELL.

University of Mississippi.

## SPANISH LITERATURE.

*Historia de Gil Blas de Santillana por Lesage, traducida por el Padre Isla*, abbreviated and edited with introduction, notes, map and vocabulary, by J. GEDDES, JR., and F. M. JOSSELYN, JR. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1903.

The first impression of Geddes and Josselyn's edition of this text received notice in the issue of MOD. LANG. NOTES for November, 1901. Now after a two years' trial of their book, the editors present a reimpression of it with many improvements. Misprints have been corrected and commendable changes have been made in the notes and the vocabulary. In its new form the book brings fresh credit to the editors, and is a fit companion to their excellent edition of the *Marianela*.

The following notes are offered as of possible interest in the preparation of later impressions. Page 2, note 8, *volvió á poner* has been translated as of the first person. Page 13, note 4, the *haz* of *hazmerreir* may be the apocopated third singular of the present indicative rather than the imperative form. Page 63, note 1, *el ama*, as this *el* is historically as much a feminine as *la*, it would seem better not to term it the masculine article, even though most of the Spanish grammars still continue to do so. Page 64, note 7, *un si es no es*, the *si* of this expression is not the affirmative adverb *yes*, but the conjunction *if*, and it should not have a written accent. P. 153, note 3, *favor al rey* might be more fully translated as "*Help in the King's name.*"

J. D. M. FORD.

Harvard University.

## FRENCH MANUSCRIPT.

PAUL MEYER, *Notice d'un Manuscrit de Trinity College, (Cambridge)*, contenant les vies en vers français de Saint Jean l'Aumônier et de Saint Clément, Pape. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1903. 4to., 51 pp.

These two French specimens of vulgarized hagiographical literature, which are accurately described from the linguistic point of view, may



be considered as valuable documents, not only on account of their rareness ("deux poèmes français dont il n'existe, à ma connaissance, aucune autre copie," p. 6), but also as illustrating the history of translation in France during the Middle Ages. As a fact, nearly all early translators handled their models with the utmost freedom. This evident lack of method is still considered as a kind of privilege by famous Perrot d'Ablancourt (author of the so-called "Belles Infidèles" and a contemporary of Louis XIV). He would continually find fault with his Classical models, correct their tenor, insert explanations of his own in the text itself, omit or cut short such passages as seemed either to disturb the harmony of his excellent prose or to present difficulties to the translator. We know nowadays that it required many centuries to establish the proper use of foot-notes and the inviolability of texts.

In our case, no ancient Classical models have been disfigured. The anonymous translator, not a monk but a person of rather pious inclinations, took to vulgarizing two saints' lives for the sake of his own edification. "Le latin est non pas traduit, mais longuement et, il faut le dire, assez platelement paraphrasé," p. 6. "La traduction n'est ni fidèle ni complète: c'est une libre paraphrase qui omet de nombreux passages," p. 20. His proceedings seem to be about the same as those of d'Ablancourt's. But there is one great difference as far as the life of "Saint Clement Pape" is concerned. The author owns that he found it necessary to invert the order of different parts of his original. But having compared the Latin text with the French version, Paul Meyer informs us of another important fact: "Le rimeur français ou plutôt anglais, ne s'est pas borné à traduire ou à paraphraser les 'Recognitiones,' mais fait entrer dans son œuvre d'autres éléments."

Which are these elements and where do they come from? The approximate solution of this complicated question is but due to the marvelous perspicacity and the fine logical argumentation of Paul Meyer. There can be no doubt, moreover, that he is now the best connoisseur of the French Middle Ages. With the help of his profound knowledge of ecclesiastical literature he establishes that the anonymous writer must have had

for his source a compilation in which probably the contents of Chapter XV of the *Apostolica historia* of the Pseudo-Abdias had been combined with a notably different reading of some chapters of the *Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli* of the Pseudo-Marcellus. ("Il y a lieu de supposer l'existence d'un texte latin intermédiaire.")

M. J. MINCKWITZ.

München.

#### SPANISH LITERATURE.

*The Complete Works of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Vol. II. The Galatea.* Edited by JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY. Translated by H. OELSNER and A. B. WELFORD. Glasgow: Gowans & Gray, 1903.

With commendable promptness Messrs. Gowans and Gray, of Glasgow, have issued another volume of their admirable and astonishingly cheap series of translations of the works of Cervantes. The four volumes of Ormsby's version of *Don Quixote* (the best English translation beyond all peradventure), was followed by the *Novelas Exemplares*, excellently Englished by Mr. Norman MacColl, and now we have the *Galatea*, a pastoral romance, and it is no small praise to say that this last translation maintains the high standard of the previous issues. Of the mixed prose and verse of which the *Galatea* is composed, Dr. Herman Oelsner has translated the prose portion, while the verse has fallen to the share of Mr. A. B. Welford, and though both these scholars have succeeded in giving excellent renderings of the original—and the task of neither was easy—yet Mr. Welford had more to contend with than his colleague. His versions of the various poems are always well done, and sometimes they are strikingly felicitous. The *Galatea*, like the other volumes of this series, contains an Introduction by the editor, Mr. James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, unquestionably one of the first living authorities upon Cervantes.

A distinguished French scholar and critic has said that Ercilla would have done better had he written his *Araucana* in prose, but evidently

Ercilla thought that a prose epic would never do, and doubtless Cervantes also thought that a pastoral romance without occasional verse scattered through it, would never be countenanced by a public that had been brought up on the *Diana* of Montemayor. And so Cervantes scattered his verse through the *Galatea* with a lavish hand. Indeed, Cervantes preened himself upon his verse, and in one instance, his *Viaje del Parnaso*, he scored a moderate success, though the postscript in prose which he has appended is by far the best thing in the work. For Cervantes's verse, though often graceful and flowing, is no better than that of a score of poets of his time, and had he written nothing else he would have disappeared in the oblivion that justly and mercifully envelops some of his fellow bards. That Cervantes was particularly pleased with his *Galatea* is evinced by the pride and satisfaction with which he refers to it on several occasions. It seems to have been the fate of the pastoral romances to remain unfinished, and to promise a sequel which never appeared, and the *Galatea* was no exception to the rule. And so, time after time Cervantes promised the second part, a promise which he never fulfilled. Indeed, throughout his whole career Cervantes seems to have cherished a singular affection for the *Galatea*. It was his first love and

'On revient toujours à son premier amour.'

Even on his death-bed his thoughts once more revert to his favorite pastoral romance;—once more the hope of finishing it is expressed almost with his dying breath:

"Puesto ya el pie en el estribo,  
Con las ansias de la muerte,"

as he himself says with that invincible cheerfulness which never deserted him.

The *Galatea*, which is better than most of the works of its class (rather equivocal praise, the reader may think), was not one of the world's successful books. It was only reprinted twice in the lifetime of its author, and it is even doubtful if Cervantes ever saw either of these reprints. Nor has the *Galatea* been more fortunate in its translations, of which the one before us is really the first one worthy of the name. The first English version appeared in 1867, "when it

occurred to a droll, strange man named Gordon Willoughby James Gyll (or James Willoughby Gordon Gill), to publish an English rendering of Cervantes's pastoral in which, as he thought, 'the rural characters are nicely defined; modesty and grace with simplicity prevailing.'" From the documents published by Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, in his Introduction, Mr. Gyll or Gill seems to have been one of those fussy, fatuous bodies, who suffered with a particularly acute case of genealogical megalokephalitis, and his vagaries are reflected in his translation of the *Galatea*, which is one of the most fearful and wonderful renderings into English, of which the language can boast. And yet this nonsense was not only published, but incredible as it must seem, it was reprinted. That Gyll's feeble flounderings should remain the only English version of the *Galatea* was an insult to the great name of its author. The admirers of Cervantes have, therefore, genuine cause for congratulation on the appearance of this translation, the first really adequate one in any language, as the editor remarks.

Prefixed to the volume is an Introduction, consisting of fifty-eight pages of closely printed matter by the editor, Mr. James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, written with all the knowledge of the subject, to the minutest detail, for which this scholar is so well known. These Introductions, admirable in every way, will be read with profit by every student of Cervantes. Indeed, so wide is their range, that they are indispensable to every worker in Spanish literature, and they form one of the most notable features of these volumes, which every student should have upon his shelves.

HUGO A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

GALDÓS'S DOÑA PERFECTA.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

In answer to Prof. Lewis's inquiry, published in the February issue of the current volume of your journal, I am able to offer one suggestion. The question concerning Manzanedo had also occurred to me, and while in Madrid I asked Galdós who he was. Galdós's answer was that "Manzanedo was a very rich man, as who should say a Vanderbilt." The comparison was Galdós's own.

Yours very truly,

JOHN D. FITZ-GERALD.

Columbia University.

- Greve, Fel. Paul.—Randarabesken zu Oscar Wilde. *Minden*: J. C. C. Bruno, 1904.
- Gulick, E. L.—Essay on Milton by T. B. Macaulay. *New York*: American Book Co., 1903.
- Harper, Charles G.—The Ingoldsby Country. *New York*: Macmillan, 1904.
- Heine, Deltrich.—Wiclif's Lehre vom Güterbesitz. Erlanger Dissertation. *Gütersloh*: C. Bertelsmann, 1903.
- Henderson, T. F.—Life of Robert Burns. *London*: Methuen, 1904.
- Heyman, Harald E.—Studies on the Havelok-Tale. Dissertation. *Upsala*: Wretmans Tryckeri, 1903.
- Hollack, Erich.—Vergleichende Studien zu der Hereford-Wiclif'schen und Purvey'schen Bibelübersetzung mit der lat. Vulgata. Dissertation. *Leipzig*: 1903.
- Huntington, Tuley Francis.—Elements of English Composition. *New York*: Macmillan Co., 1904.
- Influence of the English Church on Anglo-Saxon Civilizations, The.—Lectures before the Churchman's League of the District of Columbia in 1903. *New York*: Edwin S. Graham, 1904.
- Jellinghaus, H.—Ossians Lebensanschauung. *Tübingen*: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904.
- Julien, L'Abbé S.—Jules César, Tragedie en Cinq Actes; par William Shakespeare. Texte Anglais, revu et annoté. 5e Edition. *Tours*: Mame, 1904.
- Keats, John.—Poems, with Introduction by Laurence Binyon and Notes by John Masefield. *London*: Methuen, 1903.
- Kent, Charles W.—Poems by Edgar Allan Poe. *New York*: Macmillan Co., 1904.
- Kitchin, G. W.—Ruskin in Oxford, and Other Studies. *London*: J. Murray, 1904.
- Klapper, J.—Untersuchungen zu den St. Galler Spiele von der Kindheit Jesu. Dissertation. *Breslau*: 1903.
- Krackow, Otto.—Die Nominalcomposita als Kunstmittel im altengl. Epos. Berlin Dissertation. *Weimar*: 1903.
- Kron, R.—Verdeutschungswörterbuch der Englischen Umgangssprache. *Karlsruhe*: J. Bielefeld, 1903.
- Kronenberg, E.—George Peele's "Edward the First." Eine Litterarhistorische Untersuchung. Dissertation. *Jena*: 1903.
- Lake, B.—A General Introduction to Charles Lamb, together with a Special Study of his Relation to Robert Burton, the Author of the "Anatomy of Melancholy." Dissertation. *Leipzig*: 1903.
- Lenschel, Max.—Autobiographisches in Smollett's "Roderick Random." Dissertation. *Leipzig*: 1903.
- Liddell, Mark H.—Shakespeare's Tempest. ["Elizabethan" Edition.] *New York*: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1904.
- Lounsbury, Thomas R.—The Standard of Pronunciation in English. *New York*: Harper & Bros., 1904.
- Lowe, David.—Burn's Passionate Pilgrim or Tait's Indictment of the Poet, with Other Rare Records. *Glasgow*: Wilson, 1904.
- Madan, Falconer.—A Chart of Oxford Printing. 1468-1900. Presentation Edition. *Oxford*: 1904.
- Malory, Sir Thomas.—The Story of Elayne, the Fair Maid of Astolat. [The Astolat Oakleaf Series.] *Guildford*: A. C. Curtis, 1903.
- Mansford, Charles.—Tennyson's In Memoriam. Edited with Analysis and Notes. *London*: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1904.
- Martin, Stapleton.—Izaak Walton and His Friends. *London*: Chapman & Hall, 1903.
- McKerrow, Ronald B.—The Works of Thomas Nashe. Edited from the Original Texts, in 4 vols. Vol. I. *London*: Bullen, 1904.
- Mead, William Edward.—The Squyr of Lowe Degre: a Middle English Romance. Edited in all the extant forms, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. [The Albion Series of Anglo-Saxon and Middle English Poetry. General editors: J. W. Bright and G. L. Kittredge.] *Boston*: Ginn & Co., 1904.
- Meyer, Rudolf.—Die Politische Stellung Jonathan Swifts. Dissertation. *Leipzig*: Emil Slausch, 1903.
- Millidge, F. A.—Byrons Beziehungen zu seinen Lehrern und Schulkamaraden und deren Einfluss auf seine Literarische Tätigkeit. Dissertation. *Erlangen*: 1903.
- Milton's Comus.—Facsimile Reprint. *New York*: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1904.
- Minchin, Harry Christopher.—Cowley's Essays. Edited. *London*: Methuen & Co., 1904.
- Oehninger, Ludwig.—Die Verbreitung der Königssagen der Historia Regum Britanniae von Geoffrey of Monmouth in der Poetischen Elisabethanischen Literatur. München Dissertation. *Königingen a. M.*: Meschett & Hissiger, 1903.
- Onions, C. T.—Advanced English Syntax. *London*: Sonnenschein, 1904.
- Otto, Walther.—William Cullen Bryant's Poetische Werke und Übersetzungen. Dissertation. *Leipzig*: J. J. Weber, 1904.
- Oxford English Dictionary.—Vol. VII, Outjet-Ozyat. *Oxford*: 1904.
- Palmer, F. V. N.—Poets of the South. A Series of Biographical and Critical Studies, with Typical Poems. Annotated. *New York*: American Book Co., 1904.
- Patterson, Arthur S.—L'Influence d'Edgar Poe sur Charles Baudelaire. Thèse pour le Doctorat d'Université de Grenoble. *Grenoble*: Allier Frères, 1903.
- Pollard, Alfred W.—English Miracle Plays. Edited. Fourth ed., revised. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1904.
- Proselegel, Theodor.—The Book of the Gouvernance of Kynges and Prynces. Die von Lydgate und einem Anonymus hinterlassene ne. Bearbeitung des Secretum Secretorum, kritisch untersucht. Dissertation. *München*: 1903.
- Raleigh, Walter.—The English Novel. Being a Short Sketch of its History from the Earliest Times to the Appearance of Waverley. *London*: Murray, 1903.
- Reber, Alberto.—W. Shakespeare; Lord Byron; Shelley. Edited. *Palermo*: G. Bondi & Co., 1903.
- Robinson, William C.—The Mirrour of Justices. [William Hughes's Translation.] Introduction by William C. Robinson. *Washington*: John Byrne & Co., 1904.
- Robynson, R.—Sir Thomas More's Utopia. Translated, with Life of Sir Thomas More by his son-in-law, William Roper. *London*: G. Bell, 1903.
- Rolle, William J.—Shakespeare's comedy of As You Like It. Edited, with Notes. *New York*: American Book Co., 1903.
- Rossetti, W. M.—Shelley's Adonais. New Edition, Revised with the Assistance of A. O. Prickard. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Rossetti, W. M.—The Poetical Works of Christina Georgina Rossetti, with Memoir and Notes. *London*: Macmillan, 1904.
- Sampson, George.—Lyrical Ballads. 1798-1805. Wordsworth and Coleridge. Edited with Introduction and Notes. *London*: Methuen, 1903.
- Schelling, Felix E.—'Eastward Hoe,' by Jonson, Chapman, and Marston; and Jonson's 'The Alchemist.' [The Belles-Lettres Series.] *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co., 1904.
- Schelling, Felix E.—The Merchant of Venice. [Gateway Series.] *New York*: American Book Co., 1903.
- Schneider, Wilhelm.—Das Verhältnis von Colley Cibbers Lustspiel, "The non-Juror," zu Molières "Tartuffe." Halle-Wittenberg Dissertation. *Halle*: C. A. Kaemmerer & Co., 1903.
- Schweitzer, C., et Vincent, A.—English Reader. *Paris*: Capimont et Cie., 1903.
- Shakespeare.—Poems and Sonnets, with Introduction by Edward Dowden. *London*: Paul, Trübner & Co., 1903.
- Shakespeare.—The Royal Shakespeare, with Introduction by E. F. Furnivall. 34 Parts. Part I. *London*: Cassell, 1903.
- Siefken, Orgles.—Das Geduldige Weib in der Englischen Literatur bis auf Shakspeare. Teil I: Der Konstanztetypus. Leipzig Dissertation. *Rathenow*: Max Babenzien, 1903.
- Siret et Elwall, A.—Eléments de la Grammaire Anglaise; par Siret. Edition revue et augmentée de Nouvelles Considérations sur l'Article "the"; par A. Elwall. *Paris*: Delalain Frères, 1903.
- Sloan, J. M.—John Gibson Lockhart's "Life of Robert Burns." Edited. *London*: Hutchinson, 1904.
- Smith, D. N.—Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare. *London*: Macmillan Co., 1904.
- Sollas, Hortha.—Goldsmith's Einfluss in Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert. Dissertation. *Heidelberg*: Karl Rössler, 1903.



## GERMAN PHILOLOGY.

**Ballas, Joh. Geo.**—Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Trierischen Volkssprache. *Trier*: F. Lintz, 1903. 8vo., 52 pp. M. 0,75.

**Eicke, Heinr.**—Der Gebrauch des Adjektivs bei Walther v. d. Vogelweide. *Hildesheim*: F. Borgmeyer, 1904. 8vo., vi and 49 pp. M. 1.— (Dissert.).

**Held, Karl.**—Das Verbum ohne pronominales Subject in der älteren deutschen Sprache (= Palaestra, XXXI.) *Berlin*: Mayer & Müller, 1903. 8vo., xiii and 164 pp. M. 5.—

**Henne, Adf.**—Das lateinische Sprachmaterial im Wortschatz der deutschen, französ. u. englischen Sprache. *Leipzig*: Avenarius, 1904. 8vo., xviii and 1236 pp. Half mor. M. 16.—

**Kähler, Frdr.**—Forschungen zu Pytheas' Nordlandreisen. [Aus: Festschr. des Stadtgymn. zu Halle.] *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1903. 8vo., 60 pp. M. 1,60.

**Kralik, Rich. v.**—Das deutsche Götter- u. Heldenbuch, gesammelt u. erneuert. Vols. III-VI. *München*: Allgem. Verlags-Gesellschaft, [1903]. 8vo. M. 2,50, b'd M. 3,60 each vol.

**Krüger, A.**—Rechtschreibe-Merkblatt. *Danzig*: Homann, 1904. 4to., 2 pp. M. 0,08.

**Lange, Carl Fr. Aug.**—Maler Müllers Jugendsprache. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der philosoph. Doktorwürde an der Univ. Michigan. *Ann Arbor, Mich.*: Geo. Wahr, 1904. 8vo., xvii and 68 pp.

**Lohmeyer, Th.**—Die Hauptgesetze der german. Flussnamengebung. *Kiel*: Lipsius & Fischer, 1904. M. 1,20.

**Nadrowski, R.**—Beiträge zur deutschen Wortforschung. *Leipzig*: G. Fock, [1904]. 8vo., 12 pp. M. 0,60. (Progr.)

**Schiller, Karl.**—Handbuch der deutschen Sprache. 2. Aufl., hrsg. v. Frdr. Bauer u. Frz. Streinz. 1. Tl. Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. *Wien*: A. Hartleben, [1904]. 8vo., 720 pp. Cloth M. 9.—

**Viereck, L.**—Zwei Jahrhunderte deutschen Unterrichts in den Verein. Staaten. Mit 5 Gruppenbildern u. 8 Vollbildern. *Braunschweig*: Vieweg & S., 1903. 8vo., xvi and 293 pp. M. 5.—, cloth M. 6.—

## GERMAN LITERATURE.

**Baumbach, Rudolf.**—Das Habichtsfraulein. Eine Dorfgeschichte aus dem Thüringer Wald. With notes, vocabulary, and material for convers. exercises by W. Bernhardt. *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co., 1904. 12mo., vi and 191 pp. Cloth.

**Benzmann, Hans.**—Moderne deutsche Lyrik. Mit literargesch. Einleitung u. biograph. Notizen. *Leipzig*: Th. Reclam jun., [1904] (= Universal-Biblioth., No. 4511-4515). 16mo., 592 pp. M. 1.—, cloth M. 1,50.

**Bürkner, Rich.**—Herder. Sein Leben u. Wirken. Mit Bildnis. (= Geisteshelden, 45. Bd.) *Berlin*: E. Hoffmann & Co., 1904. 8vo., viii and 287 pp. M. 3,60, b'd M. 4,80.

**Campe, Joa. H.**—Robinson der Jüngere. Abridged and edited by C. H. Ibershoff. *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co., 1904. 12mo., iv and 201 pp.

**Dichter, deutsche, des 19. Jahrh.** Aesthetische Erläuterungen, hrsg. v. O. Lyon. No. 11 (C. F. Meyer, Jürg Jenatsch), 12 (Grillparzer, Die Ahnfrau), 13 (E. Avenarius), 14 (Sudermann, Heimat). *Leipzig*: B. G. Teubner. 8vo. M. 0,50 each no.

**Ebert, M.**—Der Stil der Heine'schen Jugendprosa. *Berlin*, 1903. 8vo., 56 pp. Diss.

**Elster, Ernst.**—Über die Elemente der Poesie und den Begriff des Dramatischen. *Munich*, 1903. 4to., 18 pp. Univ.-Progr.

**Euphorion.**—Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte, hrsg. von August Sauer. 10. Bd. *Leipzig and Wien*: C. Fromme, 1903. 8vo., x and 873 pp. M. 16.—

**Fischer, Karl.**—Eduard Mörikes künstlerisches Schaffen u. dichterische Schöpfungen. *Berlin*: O. Elsner, 1903. 8vo., vii and 202 pp. M. 3.—, cloth M. 4.—

**Ford, R. Clyde.**—Elementary German for sight translation. *Boston*: Ginn & Co., 1904. 12mo., 43 pp. Cloth.

**Fouqué, F. De La Motte.**—Undine. With introduction, notes and vocabulary by J. H. Senger. *New York, etc.*: American Book Company, [1903]. 8vo., 174 pp.

**Freytag, Gust.**—Vermischte Aufsätze aus den J. 1848 bis 1894. Hrsg. v. Ernst Elster. 2. Bd. *Leipzig*: S. Hirzel, 1903. 8vo., xiii and 456 pp. M. 6.—, b'd M. 8.—

**Fulda, Ludw.**—Schiller u. die neue Generation. Ein Vortrag. *Stuttgart*: Cotta, 1904. 8vo., 44 pp. M. 0,75.

**Gaetgens zu Ysentorff, Herm.**—Napoleon I. im deutschen Drama. *Frankfurt a/M.*: M. Diesterweg, 1903. 8vo., viii and 149 pp. M. 3.—, b'd M. 4.—

**Georgy, Ernst Aug.**—Die Tragödie Friedr. Hebbels nach ihrem Ideengehalt. *Leipzig*: E. Avenarius, 1904. 8vo., xii and 334 pp. M. 3,75, cloth M. 4,50.

**Goethe.**—Hermann u. Dorothea. With introduction, notes and vocabulary by W. A. Adams. *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co., 1904. 8vo., xii and 189 pp. Cloth.

**Goethe.**—Märchen u. Kleinere Erzählungen. Ausgewählt v. Hans Marshall (= Bibliothek der Gesamtlitt. des In- u. Auslandes, Nr. 1735 & 1736.) *Halle*: O. Hendel, 1903. 8vo., iv & 180 pp. M. 0,50, b'd M. 1,50.

**Goethe.**—Das Märchen. Edited by Charles A. Eggert. *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co., 1904. 12mo., VII & 109 pp.

**Goethe-Briefe**, hrsg. v. Phil. Stein. 5. Bd. Im neuen Jahrhundert, 1801-1807. *Berlin*: O. Elsner, 1904. 8vo., xiv & 317 pp., w. portr. M. 3.—, cloth M. 4.—, half mor. M. 5.—

**Goethe's Gedichte in Auswahl.** Schulausgabe, hrsg. v. G. Frick. *Leipzig*: B. G. Teubner, 1903. 8vo., 168 pp. M. 0,50, cloth M. 0,75.

**Goethe's lyrische Gedichte**, ausgewählt u. erklärt v. J. Heuwer. 3. Aufl. *Paderborn*: F. Schöningh, 1903. 8vo., viii and 172 pp. Cloth M. 1,50.

**Goethe u. Schiller.**—Lyrische Gedichte, in e. Auswahl für den Schulgebrauch hrsg. v. H. Vockeradt. *Münster*: Aschendorff, 1903. 8vo., 301 pp. Cloth M. 1,50.

**Gottfried v. Strazburg.**—Tristan u. Isolde. Neu bearb. v. Wilh. Hertz. 4. Aufl. *Stuttgart*: Cotta, 1904. 8vo., x and 574 pp. M. 6,50, half mor. M. 8,50.

**Grillparzer.**—Der Traum ein Leben. Für den Schulgebrauch hrsg. v. P. Pachaly. *Münster*: Aschendorff, 1903. 8vo., 168 pp. Cloth M. 1,10.

**Grillparzer's Meisterdramen.** In 6 Bdn. *Berlin*: A. Weichert, 1904. 8vo. Cloth (in 1 vol.) M. 1,75.

**Grillparzer's Werke.** Hrsg. v. Rud. Franz. Kritisch durchgesehen u. erläuterte Ausgabe (in 5 Bdn.) *Leipzig*: Bibliogr. Institut, [1903]. 1. Bd. 8vo., 64 & 432 pp., w. portr. & facs. Cloth M. 2.—, half mor. M. 3.—

**Halm, Frdr.**—Die Marzipan-Lise.—Die Freundinnen. Zwei Erzählungen. *Leipzig*: Ph. Reclam jun., [1904.] (= Universal-Bibliothek, No. 4525). 16mo., 87 pp. M. 0,20.

**Hebbel's ausgewählte Werke** (in 6 Bdn.), hrsg. v. Rich. Specht. 3. u. 4. Bd. *Stuttgart*: Cotta, [2903]. 8vo., 372 and 345 pp. Cloth M. 1.— each vol.

**Herder's Werke.** Hrsg. v. Th. Matthias. Kritisch durchgesehen u. erläutert. Ausgabe. 5 Bde. *Leipzig*: Bibliograph. Institut, [1903]. 8vo., w. portr. and facs. Cloth M. 10.—, half mor. M. 15.—

**Jokuff, Ernst.**—Die Faustsage. Ihre Entstehung u. Wandlung bis auf Goethe. *Hamburg*: J. Kriebel, 1904. 8vo., 27 pp. M. 0,60.

**Jonas, Fritz.**—Schillers Seelenadel. *Berlin*: E. S. Mittler, 1904. 8vo., vii and 231 pp. M. 3.—, b'd M. 4.—

**Keller, Ludw.**—J. G. Herder u. die Kultgesellschaften des Humanismus. 2. Aufl. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1904. 8vo., 106 pp. M. 2,50.

**Kleist, Heinr. v.**—Prinz Friedrich v. Homburg. Mit ausführl. Erläuterungen v. J. Heuwer. 3. Aufl. *Paderborn*: F. Schöningh, 1903. 8vo., 179 pp. w. portr. Cloth M. 1,50.

**Kuenen, Ed.**—Schillers Jungfrau v. Orleans (= Die deutschen Klassiker, erläutert u. gewürdigt, Bd. 2.) 5. Aufl. *Leipzig*: H. Bredt, 1904. 8vo., 96 pp. M. 1.—, b'd M. 1,30.

**Kuhn, G.**—Idris u. Zenide. Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnis der Sprache Wielsands in seinen epischen Dichtungen. *Würzburg*: 1901. 8vo., 66 pp. Diss.

**Lessing, G. E.**—Sämtliche Werke, mit e. Biographie v. Max Arend u. dem Bildnis des Dichters. Ausgabe in neuester Rechtschreibung. *Leipzig*: C. Grumbach, (1903). 5 Bde, 8vo. Cloth M. 10.—, half mor. M. 15.—, half calf M. 28.—